DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 855 HE 019 220

AUTHOR	Allen, Walter
TITLE	Gender and Campus Race Differences in Black Student Academic Performance, Racial Attitudes and College Satisfaction.
SPONS AGENCY	Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	Mar 86
NOTE	123p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Education Foundation, 340 W. Peachtree Street, NW, Suite 250, Atlanta, GA 30308 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Black Colleges; *Black Students; *College Students; Comparative Analysis; Grade Point Average; Higher Education; Occupational Aspiration; Racial Attitudes; Racial Relations; *Sex Differences; State Universities; *Student Adjustment; Student Attitudes; Student Participation; Whites
IDENTIFIERS	*Student School Fit

ABSTRACT

Student academic performance, racial attitudes, and college satisfaction were examined with a national sample of black students attending selected predominantly white and historically black, state-supported universities. The effect of student background, campus experiences, and personality orientation was investigated. Specific variables included: socioeconomic status, high school grade point average (GPA), involvement in and adjustment to campus life, academic competitiveness of the college, race relations on the campus, self-concept, and occupational aspirations. Data were obtained for 1,583 students from the 1981 (response rate: 27%) and 1983 (response rate: 35%) versions of the National Study of Black College Students (housed at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor). Grades were significantly higher for males and students on black campuses, and students with higher grades reported greater satisfaction with and involvement in college life. High school GPA was the strongest predictor of college grades for all subgroups except black females on white campuses. Discrimination was reported by black students at white campuses. Evidence suggests that college grades will be highest where students are happier and more satisfied with college life. Ten recommendations are offered, including precollege enrichment programs, better college-school coordination, and coaching for standardized tests. Five pages of references and statistical tables are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Gender and Campus Race Differences in Black Student Academic Performance, Racial Attitudes and College Satisfaction

ED268855

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SEF

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 019 220

Southern Education Foundation
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

GENDER AND CAMPUS RACE DIFFERENCES IN BLACK STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, RACIAL ATTITUDES AND COLLEGE SATISFACTION

WALTER ALLEN
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN AT ANN ARBOR

A REPORT OF RESEARCH COMPLETED
UNDER A GRANT FROM THE
SOUTHERN EDUCATION FOUNDATION, INC.

MARCH, 1986

Copyright © 1986 by the Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia. All rights reserved. Printed in the USA.

This document is being published and distributed by the Southern Education Foundation. The interpretations and conclusions contained in this publication represent the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

FOREWORD

The Southern Education Foundation and the family philanthropies which preceded it have had a special and continuing interest in the education of Black Americans for more than a hundred years. The Foundation has been concerned particularly with programs aimed at increasing and improving higher education opportunities for blacks in the South.

In April, 1974, the Board of Directors (renamed Board of Trustees in 1984) established a special project, the Higher Education Program, to address issues which were surfacing as a result of the then Adams v. Richardson case. Under this higher education component, the Foundation supported coalitions formed by citizens to monitor state desegregation plans, sponsored conferences and workshops, published papers, monographs and documents, and awarded general grants which focused specifically on achieving equity in higher education in the ten states originally affected by the Adams case.

In September, 1978, the Higher Education Program proposed concentrating a major portion of its allocation on a Research Task Force which was formed to plan a research agenda for the Foundation and to commission research projects. This body of six educators has commissioned over 20 studies since its inception; this document is presented as part of the Higher Education Program Research Series. Other publications which are part of the series are listed at the end of this report and are available to the public at a cost of $5.00 each.

SEF has been able to expand its Higher Education Program as a result of receiving grants since July, 1983 from the Ford Foundation; the publication of this report is made possible by the grants.

A list of other Foundation publications may be obtained by writing to the Southern Education Foundation.

Thank you.

SOUTHERN EDUCATION FOUNDATION
340 W. Peachtree St., N.W.
Suite 250
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
(404)523-0001

March, 1986

Elridge W. McMillan, President

Price: $5.00

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the Southern Education Foundation for sponsoring this research, to Ms. Karima Al-Amin of the Foundation and to the members of the Research Task Force for their important critiques of the project design and the final report. This project was also generously funded by the Ford and C. S. Mott foundations. I am thankful to Linn Cary and Suzanne Feurt, my respective foundation project officers, for their continued support of this endeavor. Dr. Velma Burtley, formerly of Mott Foundation, and Ms. Marian Faldet were instrumental in launching this research and I thank them for the impetus.

Valuable critiques of an earlier draft of this report provided by Drs. Nesha Z. Haniff, Bruce R. Hare, A. Wade Smith and Gail E. Thomas are acknowledged with great appreciation. I also gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of the students studied and contributions from my colleagues on the research team and on the project advisory panel. Without their unselfish assistance this project could not have been completed. Angela Haddad, a graduate student in Sociology and project research assistant, was indispensable for her assistance with data analysis. Mr. Stan Barrett and Ms. Kathryn Day were excellent in typing several drafts of this report.

I dedicate this report to my mother, Freddie Mae Allen, who kept the faith and who kept going even though life was no "Crystal Stair". You have been a source of inspiration and a wellspring of strength in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables iii

Chapter 1. Background for the Study....1

Campus Race Differences
Black Students on White Campuses
Black Students on Black Campuses
Student Gender Differences

Chapter 2. Problem and Methods of Study....16
Research Questions
Sample and Data
Measures
Plan of Analysis
Limitations of the Study

Chapter 3. Empirical Findings....30
Key Patterns in the Data: A Descriptive Analysis
Tests of Bivariate Research Hypotheses
Tests of Multivariate Research Hypotheses

Chapter 4. Summary, Discussion and Implication....71
Interpretation of Findings
Implications: An Agenda for Action

References....85
Appendix....90

Table A-1. Percentage Distribution for Study Variables by Student Gender and College Race....91

Table A-2. Percentage Distribution for Study Variables...95 by the Four Student Gender/Campus Race Subgroups

Table A-3. Correlation Matrix for Variables in the Study: Means and Standard Deviations....102

National Study of Black College Students Research Collaborators and Advisory Committee Members....104

Study Questionnaires....108

About The Author....109

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Academic Performance by Student Gender and Campus Race	32
2	Attitudes Toward Interracial Dating by Student Gender and Campus Race	36
3	Attitudes Toward Black Student Unity by Student Gender and Campus Race	37
4	Relation of Campus Activities to Interests by Student Gender and Campus Race	40
5	Whether Considered Leaving College by Student Gender and Campus Race	41
6	Relations with White Faculty by Student Gender and Campus Race	43
7	Relations with White Staff by Student Gender and Campus Race	44
8	Mother's Education by Student Gender and Campus Race	46
9	High School Grade Point Average by Student Gender and Campus Race	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
10	College Major by Student Gender and Campus Race	50
11	Academic Competition by Student Gender and Campus Race	51
12	Faculty Relationships by Student Gender and Campus Race	53
13	Self-Concept by Student Gender and Campus Race	54
14	Occupational Eminence Striving by Student Gender and Campus Race	56
15	Occupational Aspirations by Student Gender and Campus Race	59
16	Educational Aspirations by Student Gender and Campus Race	61
17	Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Total Sample	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
18	Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Black Males on White Campuses	67
19	Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Black Females on White Campuses	68
20	Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Black Males on Black Campuses	69
21	Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Black Females on Black Campuses	70
A-1	Percentage Distributions for Study Variables by Student Gender and Campus Race	91
A-2	Percentage Distributions for Study Variables by the Four Student Gender/Campus Race Subgroups	95
A-3	Correlation Matrix of Variables in Study: Means and Standard Deviations	103

CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

> By enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Congress committed this nation to the goal of equal opportunity for higher education for all Americans, regardless of race or economic circumstance. While progress has been made, this goal, the key to virtually all managerial and professional jobs, remains for the disadvantaged student an unfulfilled promise.
>
> (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968, p. 452.)

Nineteen eighty-five marked the thirty-first anniversary of the Supreme Court's historic decision outlawing racial segregation in the nation's public schools. Over the ensuing years, a generation of black students has attended school relieved of the burdens of de jure (if not de facto) segregation. Much has been said and written about these black students' experiences in desegregated schools. For the most part, however, this attention has focused on the elementary and secondary school years. As successive waves of black students have completed their high school educations and moved into college, recent attention has been directed towards the post-secondary, educational process (Fleming, 1984; Astin, 1982; Blackwell, 1981; Thomas, 1981). Nevertheless, black student experiences and outcomes in institutions of higher education continue to be a relatively neglected research topic. In an attempt to increase our understanding of blacks in college, this study proposes to compare black student characteristics, experiences, and outcomes in historically black and predominantly white, state-supported universities.

Over the past 30 years, profound changes have occurred in black student patterns of college attendance in the Uinted States. Whereas previously the overwhelming majority of black college students were enrolled in historically black institutions, by 1973 that percentage had dropped

significantly to roughly one-quarter (Anderson, 1984). Three fourths of all black students in college currently attend predominantly white institutions of higher learning (National Center for Education Statistics, 1982). An estimated 57% of all baccalaureate degrees awarded to black students during 1978-1979 were granted by predominantly white colleges and universities (Deskins, 1981). At first glance, this relatively rapid redistribution of black student college enrollments and graduations might occasion celebration among those interested in the achievement of black educational equity. Certainly the goal of desegregating public schools in this country, enacted into law by the Supreme Court decision of 1954, seems to have moved forward in the country's colleges and universities. However, more careful examination of the situation leads one to draw less optimistic conclusions.

Black students on predominantly white campuses continue to be severely disadvantaged relative to white students in terms of persistence rates (Astin, 1982; Thomas, 1981; Di Cesare, 1972), academic achievement levels (Nettles, et al., 1985; Smith and Allen, 1984); enrollment in advanced degree programs (Hall, Mays and Allen, 1984; Astin, 1982; Blackwell, 1981; Abramowitz, 1976;) and overall psycho-social adjustments (Allen, 1985; Allen, 1984; Fleming, 1984; Webster, Sedlacek and Miyares, 1979;). Black students on historically black campuses are disadvantaged relative to students (both black and white) on white campuses in terms of family socioeconomic status (Thomas, 1984; Morris, 1979), high school academic records (Astin and Cross, 1981), caliber of university instructional faculty and facilities (Fleming, 1984; Williams, 1981), academic specializations selected (Thomas, 1984; Haynes, 1981), and enrollment in advanced study (Pearson and Pearson, 1985; Blackwell, 1982; Miller, 1981).

Given the evidence of race differences in educational experiences and outcomes cited here and elsewhere, some scholars have concluded that a crisis exists for black college students (Billingsley, 1981; Ballard, 1974). Although we consider such conclusions to be premature, there is an urgent need to improve the lot of black students enrolled at these schools. General limitations in our knowledge about the educational process in institutions of higher learning hamper efforts to improve black student experiences and outcomes (Allen, 1985; Hall and Allen, 1982; Pantages and Creedon, 1978). We are particularly lacking in our understanding of what happens to black students at critical steps along the way between college entry, the election of a major field and graduation or dropping out (Allen, 1982; Astin, 1982). This research project looks at three student outcomes: academic performance, racial attitudes and college satisfaction, in a national sample of black students who attend selected predominantly white and historically black, state-supported universities. The study explores how these student outcomes are related to student background characteristics, the nature of student experiences on the campus and the student's particular personality orientation.

Campus Race Differences

Black Students on White Campuses

Studies of black students attending predominantly white post-secondary institutions commonly incorporate the following concerns regarding black students: 1) their social and economic characteristics (Allen, 1982; Blackwell, 1982); 2) their levels of adjustment in predominantly white institutions (Fleming, 1981; Webster, Sedlacek and Miyares, 1979); and 3) their academic success (attrition rate) in these institutions (Braddock and Dawkins, 1981; Nettles, et al., 1985). The literature implies a causal ordering among factors thought to influence the experiences and outcomes of black students in desegregated, post-secondary settings. In what is essentially a social-psychological model, student characteristics are assumed to determine student adjustment to the college setting, which in turn, influences student performance. It is further assumed that black student academic achievement suffers because of the difficulties they experience adjusting to the foreign environments presented by white colleges. Some of these models also assume that colleges experience commensurate difficulties adjusting their norms, structures, and practices in order to incorporate the characteristically different black students (Peterson et al., 1978). A major premise in the literature is that a poor fit exists between black students and predominantly white colleges (Allen, 1982).

Black students in college are different from their white peers in several respects, for example, the parents of black students are typically urban, have fewer years of education, earn less, and work at lower status jobs than is true for the parents of white students (Blackwell, 1982; Bayer, 1972; Boyd, 1974). Outgrowths of these socioeconomic status inequities are the more pronounced need among black students for college financial assistance (Ramist and Arbeiter, 1984; Morris, 1979), their typically lower average scores on college entrance examinations (Ramist and Arbeiter, 1984) and the increased probability that they enter college after having received weaker high school preparation (Ramist and Arbeiter, 1984; Thomas, 1984; Abramowitz, 1976; Morris, 1979).

Despite social and economic disadvantages, black college students are reported to exhibit aspirations which equal or exceed those of their white counterparts (Allen, 1985; Bayer, 1972; Gurin and Epps, 1975). Black students tend, however, less often than white students to actually attain their educational and occupational aspirations. Lower educational attainments are pronounced for black students in general, and for black females in particular (Hall, Mays and Allen, 1984; Smith and Allen, 1984; Gurin and Epps, 1975). Black and white college students differ substantially in the types of colleges and major fields entered, with blacks being more heavily concentrated in two-year colleges, in traditional major fields (education, social sciences, etc.), and in southern institutions (Thomas, 1984; Thomas, 1978; English, 1976). Black college students' cultural orientations, lifestyles, behaviors, and values also differ from whites' (Allen, 1984; Smith, 1981; Thomas, 1981; Ballard, 1973).

Black students attending predominantly white colleges apparently experience considerable adjustment difficulty. To be sure, many of their adjustment problems are common to all college students (Webster, 1979); but black students also face distinctive problems. For instance, many of these students often find it necessary to create their own social and cultural networks given their exclusion (self and/or other-imposed) from the wider university community. Such mechanisms in the form of fraternities/sororities, friend-kin networks, black student organizations, or black dorms perform vital support and mediation roles (Allen, 1985; Willie and McCord, 1972). On white campuses, the ability of black students to generate their own social activites, support networks and political mechanisms is limited by a scarcity of numbers (Keith, 1972; Reed, 1979). Of all problems faced by black students on white campuses, those arising from isolation, alienation, and lack of support seem to be most serious (Allen, 1985; Smith and Allen, 1984; Rosser, 1972). However, adjustment problems are also posed for black students by these schools' academic environments. The usual difficulties associated with the transition from high school into college are amplified for black students by such factors as: weak academic backgrounds, insensitive advising, poor relationships with faculty, and strong feelings of alienation (Thomas, 1981; Hedegard and Brown, 1969).

Black students evidently do not enjoy the same levels of academic success as majority students on predominantly white campuses. Whether for reasons of their distinctive characteristics or adjustment difficulties, black students perform less well academically than their white peers. On average, black students have higher attrition rates (Allen, 1982; DiCesare, 1972); lower

grade point averages (Allen, 1982; Boyd, 1974); and lower enrollments in postgraduate programs (Blackwell, 1981; Abramowitz, 1976). These students also report more academic problems (Allen, 1985; Webster Sedlacek and Miyares, 1979; Willie and McCord, 1972) and display greater disparities between educational aspirations and eventual attainments (Boyd, 1981; Braddock and Dawkins, 1981) than do white students. The academic difficulties of black students on white campuses are often compounded by the absence of remedial/tutorial programs and information exchange with whites (i.e., faculty and students) (Hall, Mays and Allen, 1984; Abramowitz, 1976; Boyd, 1974). Despite the initial difficulties most black students experience, many make the required adjustments and are academically successful in predominantly white institutions (Allen, 1985; Peterson et al., 1978; Ballard, 1973).

Past research suggests that the fit between black students and white colleges is, indeed, not a very good one. Black students differ in fundamental ways from the white students commonly served by these schools. They, therefore, experience more adjustment difficulties, more limited academic success, and higher attrition rates with definite consequences for their aspirations.

Black Students on Black Campuses

In reviewing research on black students attending historically black colleges, it is useful to organize these studies into three groups. These studies commonly focus on: 1) student background and academic skills; 2) student academic development; and 3) student psychosocial development. Unlike

studies of black students on white campuses, this research tradition assumes a proper fit between students and institution. Their values, cultural heritages, and goals are assumed to be compatible. Interestingly enough, comparisons of black students on black campuses with those on white campuses are more often conjectured rather than explicitly undertaken. Despite the scarcity of empirical support for such a position, however, white campuses are presumed to provide superior environments for black student education.

Much is made of differences between student populations at historically black and predominantly white colleges. Black students on black campuses do differ in characteristic ways from their peers (both black and white) attending predominantly white universities. Relatively speaking, black students who attend historically black colleges are disadvantaged economically compared to black and white students who attend white colleges. The typical parents of black students on black campuses earn less money, have lower educational achievement, hold lower status jobs, and are more often separated or divorced (Thomas, 1984; Morris, 1979; Gurin and Epps, 1975). Consistent with observed economic discrepancies, typical black students on black campuses have lower standardized test scores and weaker high school backgrounds than do typical black students on white campuses (Astin, 1981). A natural outgrowth of comparisons of black student populations on black and white campuses is recognition of the "special mission" of black colleges. To a large extent, black colleges enroll students who might not otherwise be able to attend college because of financial or academic barriers (Thomas, McPartland and Gottfredson, 1981; Miller, 1981; Morris, 1979). These institutions pride themselves on their ability to take poor and less well-prepared black students

where they are, correct their academic deficiencies, and graduate them equipped to compete successfully for jobs or graduate/professional school placements in the wider society (Miller, 1981; National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, 1980).

Studies of black student academic growth and development on black campuses, in fact show consistently high gains. Fleming (1984) suggests that while black students who attend historically black colleges are initially behind academically, they display greater intellectual development than do black students who attend white colleges. However, despite their greater relative intellectual gains (as measured by questionnaires and Thematic Apperception Tests) black students on black campuses continued to be disadvantaged in absolute terms vis-a-vis black (and white) students on white campuses. It should be noted, however, that the relative differences between black students on black campuses and both race students on white campuses had decreased after four years of college.

By contrast, findings from another comparative study of black student intellective development on black and white campuses suggest the absence of pronounced differences (Centra, Linn, and Parry, 1970). In either case, the findings compliment black colleges since although their student bodies are much more disadvantaged academically at the beginning of their careers, by graduation these students have managed to narrow the achievement gap between themselves and both race students on white campuses. We should be reminded at this point of the combined influence of academic and environmental factors on students' eventual levels of academic achievement and status attainment. The

relative importance of both sets of factors varies across college settings. However, predicting black academic achievement proves more problematic on white than black campuses (Braddock and Dawkins, 1981). This is probably due to the many factors described above which negatively impact black students on white campuses.

When black students on black and white campuses are compared on the dimension of psychosocial development, those on black campuses seem to fare much better. In an early study, Gurin and Epps (1975) found that black students who attend black colleges possessed positive self images, strong racial pride, and high aspirations. In striking opposition to the portrait of black students on white campuses outlined above, they described students with high self concepts, low anxiety levels, and a clear sense of purpose. Similarly, Fleming (1984) found psychosocial development to be more positive for black students attending black colleges than for those attending white colleges. Black students on black campuses reported greater satisfaction with college, more constructive relationships with faculty, higher academic motives, and fewer feelings of stress or isolation. In order to counter their stress and isolation, black students on white campuses often divert vital energies away from intellectual pursuits into efforts to fill the interpersonal void created by their statuses as grossly underrepresented minorities (Allen, 1985; Fleming, 1981).

In sum, the evidence suggests that black students on black campuses are more disadvantaged in socio-economic and academic terms than are black (or white) students on white campuses. The impact of these economic and academic disadvantages is heightened by the severe institutional disadvantages of black

colleges relative to white colleges counterparts in terms of financial resources, faculty caliber and physical plants (Williams, 1981). However, black students on black campuses display more positive psychosocial adjustments, significant academic gains, greater cultural awareness/commitment, and higher attainment aspirations. While adjustment and aspiration levels are higher for black students on black campuses, their absolute achievement levels are lower than those of black (or white) students on white campuses. Against this backdrop we need to be reminded of the disproportionate contributions made by black colleges to the current production of black B.A.'s (Deskins, 1983) and to the production of prominent Black Americans (National Center for Education Statistics, 1984).

Student Gender Differences

Researchers have identified persistent differences in the college experiences of men and women. As might be expected these differences cross the color line. In one of the earlier, more comprehensive comparisons of black men and women attending black colleges, Gurin and Epps (1975) reported interesting findings. Their most significant conclusions challenged accepted views about a black female advantage over black males. The relative and absolute disadvantage of females was consistent and showed itself in the following ways:

--Women's goals were lower on all measures of educational and occupational aspirations.
--Males were three times more likely to plan to pursue the Ph.D. degree.

--Women were more likely to aspire to jobs in the "female sector" of the economy, jobs that required less ability and effort while providing lower prestige.

--Males were more likely to be influenced in their goals and aspirations by the college attended.

The conclusion is that black women experience certain disadvantages relative to black men.

Over the past 25 years our society has undergone radical transformations in the range of opportunities available to women and blacks--or so rhetoric would have us believe. We are told that gender and race discrimination is a thing of the past and on surface the numbers seem to support this contention. Over the years the enrollment of women generally - and black women in particular - in postsecondary institutions has risen dramatically. Women as a group, and this is especially true among blacks--now outnumber men in college (National Center for Education Statistics, 1982). Still, there are reasons to doubt this rosy picture.

Gurin and Epps (1975) studied black students enrolled in 10 traditionally Black institutions from 1964-1970; over 5000 students participated in their research. Roughly 10 years later Fleming (1984) studied a comparable sample of 3,000 black college students, expanded to incorporate students attending predominantly white colleges. Fleming's basic research question of "Who gets the most out of college" yielded answers which echoed the Gurin and Epps study. According to her findings, white males on white campuses, and black males on

black campuses, derived far more benefits from college than was true for black women. Among black students, females were more anxious in competition, felt less competent and tended to be less assertive. Social passivity was especially common among black females on black campuses. On white campuses, where these females were more assertive, they paid a price in pain, feeling themselves to be more socially isolated.

Patterns were reversed for the black males studied by Fleming; they suffered most on white campuses and were most satisfied on black campuses. On white campuses black males were withdrawn and unhappy, feeling themselves to have been treated unfairly. In addition, they experienced considerable academic demotivation. At the other extreme were black males on black campuses who, like white males on white campuses, felt "in charge". Such black males showed high cognitive growth, eagerness to compete and ample social assertion. In the supportive environments provided by black colleges, black males felt more accepted and showed little anxiety about interpersonal relationships. On white campuses just the opposite was true.

Findings from a study of black students on white campuses further elaborate gender differences in educational experiences and outcomes (Smith and Allen, 1984). Analysis of a national sample of over 700 undergraduate students revealed that black males were more likely than black females to have both high aspirations and good grades. This was a surprising finding given the fact that on average black females in this sample out performed black males in the classroom as measured by grade point average. When black males and black females with comparable achievement levels were compared, the males consistently reported higher post-graduate aspirations.

A recent Southern Education Foundation research report (Thomas, 1984) reveals that the effects of differential socialization experiences carry over into black female and black male student outcomes in college. The report shows gender to be the strongest predictor of college major choice for black students in white colleges and black public colleges. Occupational expectations were the strongest predictor of college major choice. Generally speaking, being male and having high occupational aspirations was significantly predictive of majoring in the biological, technical and natural sciences. However, black students on white campuses were significantly less likely to elect majors in the natural and biological sciences, irrespective of gender.

This study of over 2,000 college students provides evidence of important gender differences within race in the characteristics, experiences and outcomes of black college students (Thomas, 1985). Besides an independent depressive effect, gender affected black women's choice of college major through its influence on career aspirations and traditional sex role orientations. Retrospectively, females reported themselves as significantly less concerned with construction/repairing, advanced mathematics, science clubs and scientists. By the same token their overriding interests revolved more around helping other people than around entering financially lucrative careers per se. It is interesting to note that only in private schools did occupational expectations exert a stronger influence than gender on black students' college major choices. This finding is consistent with the Gurin-Epps study conclusion that black women were most likely to plan on entering nontraditional occupations when they attended colleges characterized by frequent faculty/student interactions and a student culture which placed

strong emphasis on intellectual values. Put another way, black female occupational aspirations are highest and least traditional when they attend private campuses. Clearly campus race can interact in critical ways with student gender role socialization to influence observed outcomes. With the accumulated research on race and gender differences in college as a backdrop, we now turn our attention to this particular study of the effects of race and gender on college experiences and outcomes.

CHAPTER 2

PROBLEMS AND METHOD OF STUDY

This report examines three important outcomes of the college experience for black students in U.S. higher education, student academic achievement, student racial attitudes and student satisfaction with college. Of special interest are questions of how these student outcomes differ for males and females. Also of special interest are questions of how these student outcomes differ for black students who attend historically black versus those who attend predominantly white colleges. In addition, the study investigates the relationship of student outcomes to student background characteristics, to the nature of student interpersonal relations on the campus and to the student's individual personality orientation. The study's theoretical approach emphasizes connections between institutional and individual characteristics in the explanation of student outcomes. Data for the study are from a national sample of black students who are currently enrolled in selected black and white, state-supported universities.

The theoretical framework for this research is provided by two perspectives from the field of sociology, "symbolic interactionist" theory and the "social structure and personality" perspective. Symbolic interactionist theory emphasizes the importance of symbols--words, gestures, actions, body posture and other signals (verbal and nonverbal)--in human interaction. Humans use such symbols in order to communicate, negotiate common meanings, and reach agreements with one another. In this connection groups, organizations, institutions, and

societies can be reasonably viewed as contexts where human interaction occurs. Viewed from this perspective, social institutions (e.g. colleges) are defined by characteristic patterns of interaction and shared systems of agreement which regulate the interactions occurring in that context. (See the following for an elaborate discussion of symbolic interactionist theory: Wells, 1978; Huber, 1983; Blumer, 1969).

An interactionist view of the college experience stresses the exchanges that occur between individuals or categories of individuals. Although such exchanges occur within the situational context of the university (its norms, procedures and physical setting), it is the interactions themselves which would be considered paramount. It is important to examine whether the interaction of interest occurs in the college dining hall or in a classroom; whether the interaction is between students or between students and professors; whether the interaction occurs during a student government meeting or during an informal discussion. However, it is vitally important to examine questions of a more fundamental nature. Specifically, there is a need to establish how the involved actors define the situation where their interaction occurs; how they judge their respective roles in the interaction; the norms or agreements they subscribe to as guides for the interaction and their shared sense of the ultimate end(s) of the interaction. In the short-hand of symbolic interactionist theory this argument can be summarized by the term "definition of the situation."

The concept "definition of the situation" captures the ever-changing and yet stable quality of human interaction. In general, human interactions occur in contexts where the situation, actor roles and purposes of the interaction

are all fairly well set, that is, the script is written and known to the actors from their shared "definition of situation". However, for this perspective, that script merely serves to define the broad outlines of the interaction. Actors are free to improvise upon the script, to redefine and redirect, to reach outcomes that are unpredictable. In this sense the perspective is as pliant as the interaction process which it seeks to map.

The interactionist perspective is useful for this study in that it assigns black students active as opposed to passive roles in the schooling process. The students are involved in helping to define, generate, and modify the realities to which they are subject. Obviously there are limits on the ability of any student to recreate his/her college environment, or experience. Certain features and actors are simply unyielding givens. Nevertheless, the student exercises some control over how he/she responds to these givens. Thus, it becomes necessary to explain the critical differences observed in how students perceive and act when confronted with the same situation. Such information often provides the best explanation for different patterns of success and failure among students in similar circumstances. This study also draws from the social structure and personality perspective. This perspective is not so much an articulated theory as it is an analytical approach that attempts to systematically outline linkages between personality systems and larger institutional systems. Three tenets are evident in studies employing this perspective: 1) emphasis upon delineation of the components of complex macrosocial phenomena; 2) specification of the proximate social stimuli and interactions through which these macrosocial phenomena impact upon individuals, and 3) examination of the psychological processes governing individuals'

perceptions of and responses to these proximate social stimuli and interactions (see House, 1981 for a detailed discussion of the social structure and personality perspective). The social structure and personality perspective is important for this study in that it goes beyond the interpersonal environment by seeking to incorporate institutional factors as antecedent to, and psychological factors as outcomes from, such interactions. We are thus spared sterile dialogues which result from attempts to consider black student higher education outcomes without taking into account societal race discrimination (at the macro-level) or student self-esteem level (at the micro-level).

In tandem, the social structure and personality and symbolic interactionist perspectives undergird this study. Our specific concern is with three student or individual-level outcomes: academic performance, racial attitudes, and satisfaction with college. We attempt to understand these outcomes as products of the college environment where the student is enrolled. Further, we assume that the effects of the college or the environment on student outcomes will be mediated. How a student is ultimately affected by campus racial context or by traditional gender role typing will be determined by the student's interpersonal relationships and personality orientation. From the framework that this combined theoretical perspective provides, several research questions and hypotheses are identified for empirical study.

Research Questions

This report examines a wide range of research questions. These questions are centered around three student outcomes: academic performance, racial attitudes and college satisfaction. How these characteristics are related to

the student's gender and campus race context are of primary concern. The study is also concerned with three sets of causal factors judged to be antecedent to and explanatory of observed differences in student outcomes. These antecedent factors may be grouped into the following categories: student background factors (e.g., parent's socioeconomic status, high school academic record); student college experiences (e.g., involvement in campus life, academic competitiveness of the university, adjustment to college life and race relations on the campus); and student personality orientation (e.g., self-concept and occupational aspirations). The key research questions (and derived research hypotheses) addressed in this study follow. The research questions for study are determined by findings from our review of the literature.

1. HOW DOES STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE VARY IN RELATION TO STUDENT BACKGROUND, CAMPUS EXPERIENCES AND PERSONALITY ORIENTATION?

Specifically we expect:

a. Academic performance to be higher on black than on white campuses.

b. Academic performance to be higher for males.

c. Academic performance to be higher for students from high socioeconomic status families.

d. Academic performance to be higher among students who report more positive feelings about and greater involvement with campus life.

e. Academic performance to be higher among students with high self concept and high aspirations.

f. Academic performance to be higher among students who report more conservative racial attitudes.

2. HOW DO STUDENT RACIAL ATTITUDES VARY IN RELATION TO STUDENT BACKGROUND, CAMPUS EXPERIENCES AND PERSONALITY ORIENTATION?

Specifically we expect:

a. Student racial attitudes to be more conservative on white than black campuses.

b. Student racial attitudes to be more conservative for females.

c. Student racial attitudes to be more conservative for students from high socioeconomic status families.

d. Student racial attitudes to be more conservative for students who report more positive feelings about and greater involvement with campus life.

e. Student racial attitudes to be more conservative for students with high self-concept and high aspirations.

3. HOW DOES STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH COLLEGE VARY IN RELATION TO STUDENT BACKGROUND, CAMPUS EXPERIENCES AND PERSONALITY ORIENTATION?

Specifically we expect:

a. Student satisfaction with college to be higher for students on black than white campuses.

b. Student satisfaction with college to be higher for males.

c. Student satisfaction with college to be higher for students from higher socioeconomic status families.

4. WHAT IS THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF STUDENT BACKGROUND FACTORS, CAMPUS EXPERIENCES AND PERSONALITY ORIENTATION IN THE PREDICTION OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE?

It is our expectation that factors in the current environment (e.g., student interpersonal relationships on the campus), more so than personal background factors (e.g., family socioeconomic status) or personality traits (e.g., self-concept) will best explain student academic performance.

Specifically we expect:

a. Student interpersonal relationships to provide the most powerful explanation of academic performance.

b. Student gender to persist as a strong predictor of academic performance; females will have better grades.

c. Campus race to persist as a strong predictor of academic performance; students on black campuses will have better grades.

Sample and Data

The data for this monograph are from the National Study of Black College Students (NSBCS), housed at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. This study collected several waves of data on the achievements, experiences, attitudes, and backgrounds of black undergraduate students attending selected state-supported universities. All of the institutions participating in the 1981 and 1983 NSBCS were selected on the basis of regional diversity and accessibility. The population for both years of study were currently enrolled, Black American, undergraduates.

The research design relied on research collaborators on each of the participating campuses (see list of names in Appendix). Research collaborators were paid honoraria for assisting with the research project. As additional incentive to participate in the study research collaborators were

granted access to the collected data for scholarly publication and presentation at professional meetings. Data were collected using mailed questionnaires which students returned directly to the University of Michigan via Business Reply mail for coding and computer tabulation. Questionnaires focused on student family background, prior educational history, current educational experiences, and personal attitudes. The questionnaires were self-administered and took 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

The selection of students for participation in the study was random, based on lists of currently enrolled students supplied by the various university Registrars' offices. For each campus a systematic random sample with interval selection was drawn. Briefly, the sampling procedure involved first stratifying students by year of enrollment (Freshman through senior). A sampling fraction of formula P/S=I was then calculated (where P=total students in stratum; S=number of selections from stratum; and I=selection interval). The first student selection in each stratum was according to a random numbers table, thereafter I (the selection interval) was added consecutively until S (the total selections from stratum) was reached. Therefore, in each stratum the students selected were n, n+I, (n+I)+I, (n+I)+I)+I, etc., up to S. Since the size of strata varied within and across schools, sampling fractions also differed across strata. Selected students received the questionnaire and four follow-up reminder mailings.

The 1981 phase of the study collected data from black undergraduates at six predominantly white, public universities (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; University of California, Los Angeles; Arizona State University, Temple: Memphis State University; and the State University of New York, Stony Brook). In contrast, the 1983 phase

of the NSBCS collected data from black undergraduates at eight predominantly black, public universities (North Carolina Central University, Durham; Southern University, Baton Rouge, LA; Texas Southern University, Houston; Jackson State University, Jackson, MS; North Carolina A&T State University; Central State University, Greensboro; Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD; Wilberforce, OH; and Florida A&M University, Tallahassee). Both data sets were merged to compare and contrast students at predominantly white versus traditionally black universities. The final response rate for the 1981 undergraduate study is 27 per cent, while the 1983 undergraduate response rate is 35 per cent; together the data sets include 1,583 students.

Measures

Three measures of student outcomes are used in this report: student academic performance, satisfaction with college and racial attitudes. Except for one variable, "Consider leaving the University," the dependent variables used are worded the same for both years. In the 1981 survey of black students on white campuses respondents were asked:

> Have you ever seriously considered dropping out of school.....
> (1) yes.....(2) no

This question wording is to be compared with the 1983 survey of black students on black campuses when respondents were asked:

> Have you ever seriously considered leaving this university.....
> (1) yes.....(2) no

Since the difference in wording for the two versions of this question is slight and the meaning is essentially the same, we felt justified in merging the items for purposes of this analysis. However, the possibility that measurement error is introduced by combining the two questions must be acknowledged.

The other dependent variables considered in this paper are respondent's academic performance; respondent's racial attitudes; and respondent's satisfaction with college. Academic performance is measured by a self reported college grade point average, scaled as an integer number with one decimal place ranging from zero to four (e.g., 2.6 on a four-point grading scale where D=1 and A=4).

Respondent racial attitudes are measured using four different items. The items asked respondents to indicate whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with each of the following statements:

"There is a need for a national black political party...

"Interracial dating and marriage are equally as acceptable as within race dating and marriage...

"Schools with majority black student populations should have a majority of black teachers and administrators...

"There is a great deal of unity and sharing among black students at this university...

Responses to the racial attitudes items are collapsed into two categories (1 = agree and 2 = disagree) and summed to form an overall index. For purposes of bivariate comparison, the second and fourth items in the list are selected to represent student racial attitudes. Conservative racial attitudes are defined as students who reject the national black political party, who oppose interracial dating or marriage, who oppose majorities of teachers/administrators in black majority schools, and who judge black unity and sharing to be low.

Student satisfaction with college is measured by four items, the first asked about campus activities:

"How much do you, as a black student, feel part of general campus life, insofar as student activities and government are concerned?
not at all...(1) to considerable...(4)

The second measure of student satisfaction with college, whether the student had considered leaving school, is discussed above. The final two indicators of student satisfaction with college asked the student about the quality of personal relationships with white faculty and white staff at the University:

"How would you characterize <u>your</u> relations with whites at this University?"

Faculty?:/excellent...(1) to very poor...(4)
Staff People?:/excellent...(1) to very poor...(4)

The independent or predictor variables used in the multiple regression analyses for this study can be placed into three groups:

(1) **BACKGROUND FACTORS**, including campus race, student sex, mother's education and highschool grade point average.

(2) **CAMPUS EXPERIENCE FACTORS**, including feelings of involvement in campus life, level of academic competition at the university, whether considered leaving and relations with whites at the university.

(3) **SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS**, including respondent self-concept, racial attitude index and occupational aspirations.

Detailed information about the wording of all measures, their percentage distributions, intercorrelations, means and standard deviations is available in Table A-1 and Table A-2 in the Appendix. Copies of the study questionnaires are also available to interested readers by contacting the Southern Education Foundation.

Plan of Analysis

The plan of analysis for this study moves in a logical fashion from simpler examination of the data to more complex examination. The analysis begins by describing important patterns evident in these data, patterns which help to provide a thumbnail portrait or sketch of black college students on black and white campuses who consented to participate in this research. Our procedure at this point will be to summarize the distribution of students across categories of key variables.

At the next stage, cross tables are used to test the relationship(s) between two variable pairs. In most instances the intention is to better understand how observed student outcomes are related to aspects of student family background, high school experiences, campus interactions and personality. What is the direction and strength of association between selected pairs of variables? The bulk of these analyses and discussion will center around such tests of the relationship between two variables. However, where more complex associations between multiple variables are of interest, multivariate analysis is employed. The preferred method for such analyses is multiple regression. Multiple regression establishes the following: 1) the multiple correlation of specific sets of predictor variables with changes in the outcome variable and, 2) the correlation of individual variables, with changes in the outcome variable while controlling for inter-correlations with other variables in the set. Together these analyses should enable us to determine the joint and individual importance of key predictor variables in the determination of student "outcomes".

Limitations of the Study

There are important limitations to be considered in attempts to generalize findings from this research. To begin, the study was purposely restricted to state-supported universities. Although the majority of black students currently enrolled in four year degree programs attend state supported universities (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1985), there is a sizeable group of black students who attend private universities or colleges. Private universities and colleges provide different environments from those of large, state-supported universities. Thus some findings from this research may not be applicable to private institutions.

Questions can also be raised about the representativeness of the students who participated in this study. The 16 universities included in this study were purposely selected to maximize regional diversity and to insure university and research collaborator cooperation. Thus this study does not necessarily have a random or representative sample of all the state-supported universities nationally that black students attend.

High non-response rates pose another possible source of bias in the study. It may well be that our sample is biased by the inclusion of students with special motives to respond (e.g., those who are most satisfied or most dissatisfied with college). Extensive nonresponse analyses comparing sample characteristics to the national black student population profile and to the total black student population profile on selected participating campuses

convince us that the possibility of systematic biases is slight. (Interested readers may obtain copies of these reports by writing the author of this report). Nevertheless, readers should be aware of this possible source of error in the study.

Possible sources of error also result from the study's methodology. Self-completed questionnaires are often subject to bias arising from misunderstood questions and/or inconsistent answers. In a few instances, question wording differed in the 1981 and 1983 questionnaires, thus raising the possibility that incompatible constructs are combined in our analyses. Legitimate questions can also be raised about the appropriateness of survey research methodology for the examination of questions raised in this study. It may well be that ethnographic or institutional studies would be more appropiate methodologies. Certainly, these methods would help to supplement and enrich the data presented in this study.

However, the strengths of this study outweigh its weaknesses. Very few national databases on black students in U.S. higher education are available beyond aggregate, summary statistics. This study uses recent, detailed information obtained from students to focus on the specific issues confronting black students in college. Unlike many studies, this research by its specific focus on black students, includes sufficient numbers for detailed analysis and addresses the special circumstances of black students in college. This study is not without its flaws, but it is a helpful, unique source of information about the current status of black students on state- supported campuses in the United States.

CHAPTER 3
EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

This section presents findings from the empirical analysis of data collected in this study. As noted above, four key research questions guide this research. These questions summarize key areas of concern about the statuses of black students in U.S. higher education, as revealed in the published literature. The power of two characteristics, student gender and campus racial identity, is stressed in this study. Thus, these two characteristics are employed throughout the analyses as "test factors". Beyond its concern with the differences that gender and campus race might make in the prediction of black student outcomes in higher education, this report is also concerned with how other aspects of student background, campus experiences and personality relate to observed outcomes.

Key Patterns in the Data: A Descriptive Analysis

A selected comparison of student gender, class level and geographic region between the 1981 white campus subsample and the 1983 black campus subsample reveals interesting patterns for consideration. Females were more likely than males to respond to the study questionnaire on both black campuses (56 vs. 44 per cent) and white campuses (65 vs. 35 per cent). Statistics show that in 1980 black females were 57 per cent of all black students enrolled in four year university programs (National Center for Education Statistics, 1982: Table 8-9) and that black females represent 60 per cent of the black students who took the Scholastic Aptitude Test in 1981 - 1982 (Ramist and Arbeiter: 46-55). Therefore, the overrepresentation of black females among respondents in this study is not extraordinary.

The black campus and white campus samples differed significantly by the level of enrollment of respondents. Seniors were 43 per cent of the respondents on black campuses as compared to 25 per cent on white campuses. The comparable statistics for freshman students were 12 and 27 per cent respectively. The samples also differed significantly in terms of the geographic regions where school was attended. The overwhelming majority of the black campus sub-sample attends school in the South (75 per cent) as compared with 43 per cent of the white campus sub-sample. Thirty per cent of the white campus group and 12 per cent of the black campus group attends school in the West.

With these general characteristics of the subsamples as background, we now turn our attention to an examination of important differences by student gender and campus race in key variables from the study. Tables A-1 and A-2 in the appendix provide percentage breakdowns for the variables examined in this report. These variables are stratified by student gender and campus race. Readers interested in making more detailed comparisons of distributions by student gender or campus race or student gender/campus race subgroups are referred to these tables.

Tests of Bivariate Research Hypotheses

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE is found to vary in relation to student background, campus experiences and personality orientation. As expected, black students on black campuses report higher grade point averages than is true for their peers on white campuses (Table 1). Three-quarters of students in the white campuses group, versus two-thirds of students in the black campuses

group, report grade point averages of less than 3.0 on a four-point scale (ChiSquare = 24, $p < .001$). Observed gender differences are also true to our expectations, males report higher grade point averages (ChiSquare = 7, $p = .076$) These differences are less pronounced, however, than are differences between black students on black and white campuses. Females are only slightly more likely to report grade point averages below 3.0, 72 versus 68 per cent (Table 1).

Correlation analyses are used to test the other bivariate hypotheses associated with academic performance (Table A-3). These results contradict our expectation that students from higher socioeconomic status families will have higher college grades. Neither family income nor mother's educational attainment is a significant predictor of student grade point average (respective Pearson's r correlation coefficients are .051 and .052. Neither is significant). Academic performance is, however, significantly related to student satisfaction with and involvement in college life. Grades are higher for those students who have not seriously contemplated leaving school ($r = -.175$, $p < .01$) and for those students who find their interests reflected in campus activities ($r = .176$, $p < .01$). Grades are also significantly higher for students who report favorably on another dimension of college satisfaction: their relationships with university faculty ($r = -.153$, $p < .01$) and university staff ($r = -.103$, $p < .01$).

To our surprise, academic performance is not associated with high self-concept ($r = .03$) or high occupational aspirations ($r = .014$) (Table A-3). On the other hand, high educational aspirations are most

Table 1

Academic Performance by
Student Gender and Campus Race

College Grade Point Average	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Below 2.5	31.7%	28.0%	34.1%	28.0%	36.4%
2.6 to 2.99	38.6	40.3	37.4	38.1	39.2
3.0 to 3.49	23.7	24.8	23.1	26.1	20.7
Above 3.5	6.0	6.9	5.4	7.8	3.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(149.7)	(607)	(888)	(844)	(653)
	Chi Square	= 7,	p = .076	=24,	p < .001
	Cramer's V	=.068		=.125	

common among students with higher grades ($r = .181$, $p < .01$). Neither of our measures of racial attitudes was significantly related to academic performance. Whether students held conservative or radical attitudes on interacial dating or black student unity on the campus seemed not to matter for their performance in the classroom.

STUDENT RACIAL ATTITUDES do, in fact, vary by student background, campus experiences and personality orientation. Using the indicators of attitudes toward interracial dating and evaluation of unity among black students on the campus, we find that as anticipated females voice more conservative racial attitudes than males (Tables 2 and 3). A sizeable 62 per cent of women, versus 54 per cent of males, consider interracial dating to be unacceptable (ChiSquare = 11, $p < .01$). Females are also less likely to see a high degree of unity among black students on their campuses, 52 per cent of women versus 57 per cent of men report a great deal of unity among black students (ChiSquare = 4.3, $p < .05$). Comparison of these same racial attitude items across campus racial context provides support for our expectation of greater conservatism on white campuses (Tables 2 and 3). Black students on white campuses are much more likely to judge unity among black students on the campus negatively, 44 versus 62 per cent judged black student unity to be very low (ChiSquare = 49, $p < .001$). Black students on the different race campuses seem equally likely to consider interracial dating acceptable, in both settings 41 per cent of students approve.

Student racial attitudes are significantly related to economic background in only one instance (Table A-3): students from higher income families are more accepting of interracial dating ($r = .099$, $p < .01$). Student assessment of the

degree of unity among black students on campus is strongly related to having more positive feelings about and greater involvement with campus life. Students reporting positive relations with white faculty ($r = -.085$, $p < .05$) and staff ($r = -.079$, $p < .05$), and those who find their interests reflected in campus activities ($r = .177$, $p < .01$) are more likely to report the black student community on campus as beset with disunity. By the same token, students who had not considered leaving school are more likely to see disunity and discord among blacks on the campus. One can only conjecture that disaffection from peers is the price paid by students for better relations with authority figures on the campus and for greater integration into general campus activities. While such an explanation makes sense on white campuses, where black social networks are often distinct from and antithetical to white, mainstream social networks, the explanation is not nearly so reasonable for black campuses where greater consensus among these networks is assumed.

Our second measure of student racial attitudes, approval of interracial dating, is not significantly correlated with whether the student had considered leaving school or with the extent to which campus activities are seen to reflect student interests (Table A-3). However, students who maintain positive relations with faculty ($r = .119$, $p < .01$) and staff ($r = .098$, $p < .01$) are significantly more likely to attribute discord to the black student community on campus. Students with higher self-concepts and higher occupational/educational aspirations are not, as hypothesized, more likely to see disunity in the black student campus community or to favor interracial dating.

Table 2

Attitudes Toward Interracial Dating by Student Gender and Campus Race

Attitudes Toward Interracial Dating	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Equally Acceptable	41.1%	46.2%	37.7%	41.3%	40.9%
Not Equally Acceptable	58.9	53.8	62.3	58.7	59.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1542)	(611)	(930)	(860)	(682)
	Chi Square	= 11, p< .01		= .02, p = .88	
	Cramer's V	= .084		= .00	

Table 3

Attitudes Toward Black Students
by Student Gender and Campus Race

Attitudes Toward Black Student Unity	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
A Great Deal	54.1%	57.3%	51.9%	61.9%	44.1%
Very Little	45.9	42.7	48.1	38.1	55.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1544)	(609)	(934)	(862)	(682)
	Chi Square	= 4.3	$p < .05$	= 49	$p < .001$
	Cramer's V	= .053		= .178	

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH COLLEGE, like the other outcome variables, shows important differences by student gender and campus race. Looking first at the extent to which students felt campus activities reflected their interests, there are important though not striking differences by gender (Table 4). Males are much more likely to report those activities as somewhat or considerably representative of their interests, 56.4 versus 51.8 per cent (ChiSquare = 3.9, p = .269). Student satisfaction with college varied appreciably by campus race (Table 4). On black campuses, two-thirds of the students report campus activities as being somewhat or considerably representative of their interests. On white campuses the comparable figure is 38 per cent. Comparison of the extreme categories reveals great disparities by campus race in black student satisfaction with college. While 26 per cent of students on black campuses report campus activities to considerably represent their interests, only 8 per cent of black students on white campuses are so positive. At the other extreme, twice as many students on white campuses report campus activities as not at all representing their interests, (19.4 percent) versus the students on black campuses who express dissatisfaction (10 percent) with campus activities (ChiSquare = 148, $p < .001$).

Turning to our second measure of student satisfaction, whether the student had considered leaving college, gender differences are negligible (Table 1-5). Males and females are about equally likely to have considered leaving college. On the whole, roughly two-thirds of the total population had not considered leaving college (ChiSquare = .359, $p < .549$). There are significant differences by race of campus in the proportions of students who had

considered leaving college (Table 5). Surprisingly, in view of black colleges' higher retention and graduation rates, a larger percentage of students on black campuses report having considered leaving college (40 versus 33 per cent). This difference is sufficiently large to be statistically significant (ChiSquare = 7.45, $p < .01$).

Our final indicator of student satisfaction with campus life, the quality of relationships with faculty and staff, also reveals interesting differences by gender and campus race (Tables 6 and 7). Males are more likely to claim excellent relations, significantly so in the case of white staff (ChiSquare = 10, $p < .05$). Twenty-four per cent of male students (versus 19 per cent of females) claim to be on excellent terms with white faculty at their university, while 20 per cent of the men (compared to 15 per cent of women) report excellent relations with white staff.

Differences by campus race in relations with white faculty and staff are striking, students on black campuses are significantly more likely to report positive relations. The proportions of black students on black campuses claiming excellent relations with white faculty (26 versus 15 per cent) and with white staff (22 versus 12 per cent) nearly exceeds by twice the proportions on white campuses. For whatever reason(s), black students are significantly more favorable about their relations with white faculty (ChiSquare = 36, $p < .01$) and white staff (ChiSquare = 24, $p < .01$) when these occurred in a predominantly black, as opposed to white, environment.

Table 4

Relation of Campus Activites To
Interests by Student Gender and Campus Race

Campus Activities Represent Interests	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Not at all	14.1%	13.8%	14.4%	10.0%	19.4%
Very Little	32.2	29.8	33.8	24.1	42.7
Somewhat	35.9	37.0	35.2	40.1	30.4
Considerably	17.8	19.4	16.6	25.7	7.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1571)	(624)	(944)	(887)	(684)
	Chi Square	= 3.93	p = .269	= 148	p < .001
	Cramer's V	= .050		=.307	

Table 5

Whether Considered Leaving
College by Student Gender and Campus Race

Consider Leaving?	Total Population	Sex		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Yes	36.7%	35.8%	37.3%	39.7%	33%
No	63.3	64.2	62.7	60.3	67
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1560)	(614)	(943)	(869)	(691)
	Chi Square	= .359	p = .549	=7.45	p < .01
	Cramer's V	= .015		=.069	

Results from correlational analyses show mother's education and family income, as measures of student economic background, to not be statistically related with whether a student has considered leaving college (Table A-3). While the degree to which students see campus activities reflecting their interests is significantly higher for children whose mothers have high educational attainment ($r = .090$, $p < .01$), there are no clear, consistent patterns by family income. Student relations with staff are significantly less favorable where family income is highest ($r = -.085$, $p < .01$)--the same is true for relations with white faculty, although not significantly so. This finding is clarified when we remember that black student family incomes are highest on white campuses, the very settings where relations with white faculty and staff have been shown to be most negative. The pattern of high family socioeconomic status and poor relations with white faculty and staff is repeated for mother's education, where the general (but not statistically significant) trend is toward more negative relations for students with highly educated mothers.

STUDENT GENDER AND CAMPUS RACE EFFECTS, are a major focus of this study. Therefore, we now turn to an assessment of how these two sets of factors are related to other variables of interest in this study. The relationships of student gender and campus racial identity with academic performance, racial attitudes and college satisfaction are summarized above. Beyond these relationships, however, is our interest in knowing how other aspects of the student's personal background, campus experiences and psychological orientation are related to gender of student and race of campus. A series of bivariate tests of the null hypothesis of no significant gender or race

Table 6

Relations with White Faculty by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Relations With White Faculty	Total Population	Sex		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Excellent	21.2%	23.9%	19.4%	26.2%	15.3%
Good	65.3	62.6	67.4	63.4	67.7
Poor	11.6	12.0	11.2	8.5	15.2
Very Poor	1.9	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1494)	(590)	(901)	(855)	(692)
	Chi Square	= 5.29	p = .152	= 36	p < .001
	Cramer's V	= .060			= .156

Table 7

Relations with White Staff
By Student Gender and Campus Race

Relations with White Staff	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Excellent	17.0%	20.3%	15.0%	21.6%	12.3%
Good	65.6	61.2	68.5	63.5	67.9
Poor	14.4	16.0	13.3	12.3	16.5
Very Poor	3.0	2.5	3.2	2.6	3.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1378)	(526)	(849)	(693)	(685)
	Chi Square	= 10	$p < .05$	= 24	$p < .001$
	Cramer's V	= .087		= .132	

differences were run, the results yielded information on interesting commonalities and differences between the sexes and between black and white campuses.

Our comparisons of mothers' education, an important personal background factor, reveal significant differences between students on black and white campuses (Table 8). Nearly a third of students on white campuses report that their mothers graduated from college, with 11 per cent of those mothers to holding advanced degrees. By comparison, only 22 per cent of mothers of students attending black schools graduated from college. Of this group of mothers, 9 per cent held advance degrees (ChiSquare = 178, $p < .001$). Comparing the lower end of the educational ladder, a third of mothers with children attending black colleges, versus a quarter of mothers of students on white campuses, had not graduated from high school. When students are compared by sex no substanstial differences in mothers' educational attainments are noted.

Significant differences by gender and campus race are apparent when we compare student grades in high school (Table 9). Females were clearly the better student grades in high school, well over a third of females, compared to a quarter of males, reported high school grade point averages of 3.5 or better on a four-point scale. Just under three-quarters of the females had averages of 3.0 or better; the comparable figure for males being 60 per cent (ChiSquare = 33, $p < .001$). The high school academic superiority of black students attending white universities is incontestable, nearly half the students on white campuses versus 18 per cent of students on black campuses report averages of 3.5 or better (ChiSquare - 167, $p < .001$). When we are reminded of these students'

Table 8

Mother's Education by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Mother's Education	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Less than 8 years	11.3%	12.7%	10.4%	11.3%	11.4%
8 to 11 years	16.9	15.2	18.1	19.8	13.2
Highschool Graduate	35.1	35.2	35.1	27.3	45.1
Some College	11.3	11.1	11.2	19.7	.3
College Graduate	15.2	16.2	14.5	12.4	18.7
Advanced College Degree	10.2	9.5	10.8	9.4	11.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1511)	(597)	(912)	(852)	(659)
	Chi Square	= 6	p = .426	=178	p < .001
	Cramer's V	= .063		= .344	

college grade point averages (Table 1), the observed declines in academic performance from high school to college must be judged as nothing short of spectacular. It further seems to be the case that females experience a more drastic decrease in academic performance than males with the move from high school to college. It must be noted in this connection that with the move from high school to college the context changes fundamentally. College programs tend to be progressively more male-dominated environments than was true of the elementary and secondary school years which these females attended.

Looking at aspects of the student's current campus experiences, we again see important differences by gender and campus race. Males and females display the traditional differences in college major (Table 10), although to a slightly lesser extent than would likely have been true twenty years ago (ChiSquare = 29, $p < .001$). Compared with men, women are disproportionately represented in the social sciences (21 versus 18 per cent), the human service professions--e.g., social work, nursing (14 versus 10 per cent) and the humanities (7 versus 4 per cent). They are significantly underrepresented in the natural and life sciences (8 versus 11 per cent) and the entrepreneurial professions--e.g., business, engineering (48 versus 56 per cent).

Race of campus is also a significant differentiating factor in student major fields (Table 10). Seventy-three per cent of students on black campuses, versus half of students on white campuses, chose to major in some profession (ChiSquare = 102, $p < .001$). The entrepreneurial professions attract 57 per cent of professional majors on black campuses and 43 per cent of majors on white campuses. Fifteen per cent of professional majors on black campuses, versus 8 per cent on white campuses, were in the human service

Table 9

High School Grade Point Average by
Student Gender and Campus Race

High School Grade Point Average	Total Population	Sex		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Below 2.5	10.0%	13.9%	7.4%	15.0%	4.1%
2.5-2.99	22.4	27.0	19.4	27.8	15.9
3.0-3.5	35.7	32.8	37.5	39.2	31.5
Above 3.5	31.9	26.3	35.6	17.9	48.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1376)	(540)	(834)	(747)	(629)
	Chi Square	= 33	$p < .001$	= 167	$p < .001$
	Cramer's V	= .155		= .349	

professions. Surprisingly, black students seem no more (or less) likely to major in the natural and life sciences dependent on campus race. Black students on white campuses are, however, considerably more likely to major in the social sciences (24 versus 16 percent) and the humanities (9 versus 3 per cent).

The student's report of the level of academic competition on the campus is another measure of campus experience where we see important differences by gender and campus race (Table 11). Females are more likely to report the level of academic competition on campus as falling in the highest category--"considerable amount ", 39 versus 28 per cent (ChiSquare = 7, p = .064). Either female students in this sample feel more stress than males, or they are less reluctant to admit feeling such pressures--we suspect the latter to be true. Of course it should be noted that when the top two response categories are considered, a mere 5 points separate males and females. The differences by campus race in the sensed level of academic competition on campus is nothing short of profound (ChiSquare = 115, $p < .001$). Sixty-one per cent of students on white campuses use the highest possible category to report the level of academic competition, 93 per cent use one of the top two categories. The comparable figures for black students on black campuses are 13 and 64 per cent. Either the academic competition on white campuses is tremendous, compared to that on black campuses, and/or the way that students perceive and respond to whatever level of academic competition there is differs significantly by race of campus. Most likely, a combination of these two explanations is at work.

Table 10

College Major by
Student Gender and Campus Race

College Major	Total Population	Sex		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Natural/Life Science	8.9%	11.0%	7.5%	8.1%	9.8%
Entrepreneurial Professions	50.8	55.6	47.7	57.2	42.9
Human Service Professions	12.0	9.4	13.6	14.8	8.4
Social Sciences	19.6	18.4	20.5	16.3	23.8
Humanities	5.6	4.3	6.5	2.9	9.1
Undecided	3.0	1.3	4.2	.7	6.0
N =	100.0 (1544)	100.0 (608)	100.0 (933)	100.0 (863)	100.0 (681)
	Chi Square = 29 Cramer's V = .138		$p < .001$	= 102 = .257	$p < .001$

Table 11

Academic Competition by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Level of Academic Competition on Campus	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
None	2.4%	4.7%	5.7%	8.9%	.9%
Very Little	9.7	20.4	15.6	27.1	6.1
Some	41.6	46.7	39.8	51.0	31.9
Considerable Amount	46.3	28.1	38.8	13.0	61.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1574)	(612)	(927)	(853)	(689)
	Chi Square	= 7	p = .064	= 115	p < .001
	Cramer's V	= .068		= .270	

Finally, we come to student relationships with faculty, our last measure of campus experiences (Table 12). It is interesting to note in this connection that the two categories of students who report feeling the most academic pressure, females and those on white campuses, are the very ones reporting the least favorable relationships with faculty (respective ChiSquare = 5.3, $p = .152$ and ChiSquare = 36, $p < .001$). Women less often claim "excellent" relations with faculty (19 versus 24 per cent); the same is true for students on white campuses (15 versus 26 per cent). Possibly the academic competition on a campus is less stressful when a student feels him- or her-self self to have a close, warm relationship with the faculty and to share common traits (e.g., gender, race). It is also possible that males are less sensitive to or willing to acknowledge poor interpersonal relations than is true for women.

We now turn our attention to the student's psychological orientation as we continue to search for important gender and campus race effects. We note with little surprise the fact that males and females are comparable on their levels of self-concept (Table 13). Further, it is not surprising to find the sample characterized by extremely high self-concept (only 21 per cent of the total sample rated self average or below). What does give pause is the much higher self-concept ratings reported by black students on white campuses (ChiSquare = 30, $p < .001$). These students are more likely to rate themselves high (32 versus 25 per cent) and above average (55 versus 52 per cent).

Students in this study are also differentiated by sex and campus race on our measure of career striving (Table 14). Males are significantly more likely

Table 12

Faculty Relationships
by Student Gender and Campus Race

Relationship with White Faculty	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Very Poor	1.9%	1.5%	2.0%	2.0%	1.7%
Poor	11.6	12.0	11.2	8.5	15.2
Good	65.4	62.5	67.4	63.4	67.7
Excellent	21.2	23.9	19.4	26.2	15.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1494)	(590)	(901)	(803)	(691)
	Chi Square	= 5.29	p = .152	= 36	p < .001
	Cramer's V	= .060		= .156	

Table 13

Self-Concept by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Self-Concept	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Below Average	.4%	.5%	.3%	.1%	.7%
Average	20.2	19.2	20.9	24.8	14.3
Above Average	52.3	52.8	51.8	49.0	56.4
High	27.2	27.5	27.0	26.1	28.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1550)	(615)	(934)	(866)	(684)
	Chi Square	= .900 p = .826		= 30	p < .001
	Cramer's V	= .024		=.138	

to aim for the top of their intended professions, 63 versus 53 per cent (ChiSquare = 25, $p < .001$). Needless to say, the realities of differences in sex socialization patterns and in the respective responsibilities assigned men and women in the family must be factored into our interpretations of these differences. It is also necessary for us to recognize the potentially dampening effects of sparse female representation at the top of most professions, on the kinds of occupational goals that younger females set for themselves. The absence, or scarcity of female role models in high ranking professional positions places subtle, yet powerful, limitations on women's ideas of the possible as they outline their career plans.

The higher career success striving of black students on black campuses at first causes some consternation (ChiSquare = 33, $p < .001$). For we have seen evidence suggesting that black students who attend white schools are stronger academically and come from higher socioeconomic status families. Still, it is the students on black campuses who most often foresee futures at the top of their chosen professions (61 versus 52 per cent). Of course in general, an overwhelming 80 per cent of both campus groups expect to continue working hard until they are at least better than most people in their chosen professions.

Given the extraordinarily high occupational success-strivings of these students, one wonders about their aspirations for the future; whether gender or campus race significantly differentiates occupational and educational aspirations (Table 15). When we look at occupational aspirations, we see important differences by campus race (ChiSquare = 74, $p < .001$) and gender (ChiSquare = 14, $p < .05$): black students on white campuses are considerably

Table 14

Occupational Eminence
Striving by Student Gender and Campus Race

Occupational Success Striving	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Well Enough	5.8%	4.5%	6.7%	7.1%	4.1%
As Well As Most	3.9	3.2	4.4	4.2	3.5
Better Than Most	9.4	5.8	11.8	7.9	11.4
Much Better Than Most	23.7	23.2	24.1	19.3	29.5
Among Top in Profession	57.1	63.3	42.9	61.4	51.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1507)	(600)	(905)	(856)	(651)
	Chi Square	= 25	$p < .001$	= 33	$p < .001$
	Cramer's V	= .130		= .149	

more likely than black students on black campuses to anticipate future occupations in the highest prestige category (e.g., judge, corporate executive, physician), by a margin of 26 to 13 per cent. This fact, coupled with the greater intensity of academic competition may explain why black students on white campuses report lower occupational eminence strivings. Black students on white campuses may well adjust their eminence striving downward due to a clearer understanding of the competitive odds likely to be encountered.

Another possible explanation for the discrepance in eminence aspirations between black students on different race campuses may well be the obesrved differences in occupational aspirations. Black students on black campuses aspired to lower status occupations than did their counterparts on white campuses. As such they expected occupational futures in areas where the competition would typically be less intense. To this extent, the higher eminence expectations of black students on black campuses makes sense. In an area where competition is relatively less keen, a person might reasonably expect his or her chances of achieving emininence in the field to be better. Using the analogy of "a big frog in a small pond," we can better understand how black students on black campuses are able to maintain higher eminence aspirations than their academically stronger peers on white campuses. The secret lies in black students on black campuses typically aspiring to occupations that are somewhat less prestigious than those sought by black students on white campuses.

Females are significantly less likely to report occupational goals in the highest prestige category (16 vs 22 points). For females career strivings and career goals are consistently depressed. This pattern gives credence to hypo-

theses which point to gender discrimination, and subsequent psychological adjustments, as factors restricting the goal-setting and goal-striving behaviors of women. Unlike students on black campuses, women in this sample do not adjust their eminence aspirations upward as they adjust their career goals downward.

Important gender and campus race differences are also apparent in the educational aspirations reported by these students (Table 16). We see minor, but interesting differences, by gender; women are more likely to indicate the Bachelor's degree as their ultimate goal (33 versus 30 per cent). It is also interesting to note that roughly a third of the total sample do not plan to go beyond the B.A. degree. Females are less likely than males to aspire to the prestigious M.D. or J.D. degrees (15 versus 19 per cent), although they are equally likely to aspire to Ph.D. degrees. Race of campus is clearly associated with the kind of terminal degree sought by a student (ChiSquare = 135, $p < .001$). Black students on black campuses are more likely to set their sights on M.A. level degrees (44 versus 32 per cent), probably because of the disproportionate enrollment on black campuses in professional training programs where the terminal degree is a M.S.W., M.B.A., or M.R.P.. Black students on black campuses are also more likely than black students on white campuses to report the Ph.D. degree as their ultimate goal (17 versus 8 per cent). On the other hand, black students attending white universities are significantly more likely than black students on black campuses to aspire to prestigious terminal degrees in medicine or ~~law (29~~ versus 8 per cent).

Table 15

Occupational Aspirations by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Prestige Rating of Occupational Goal (100 point scale)	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
Below 60 points	13.8%	10.8%	15.8%	12.5%	15.5%
61-69 points	34.6	33.3	35.2	35.7	33.1
70-84 points	33.6	34.3	33.2	40.2	25.0
Above 85 points	18.0	21.5	15.7	11.6	26.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1499)	(594)	(903)	(848)	(651)
	Chi Square	=13.88	$p < .05$	= 74	$p < .001$
	Cramer's V	= .096		= .222	

Tests of Multivariate Research Hypotheses

Multiple regression analysis is a useful tool for ascertaining relationships between a large number of variables. In this particular instance we have examined the relationship of our main outcome variable, academic performance, to a series of other, predictor variables. The questions asked are multifold. First we ask the extent to which observed significant, two-variable relationships persist once the distorting effects of other variables are controlled. Second, multiple regression analysis allows us to establish the joint ability of a set of predictor variables to account for observed variation in an outcome variable (interested readers should see Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973 for a detailed discussion of multiple regression analysis). The predictive model on which these regressions are based tests the individual, and combined, contributions of nine variables to the explanation of college grades. The predictor variables can be neatly grouped into three categories of effects: student background factors (mother's education, high school grade point average); campus experiences (involvement in campus activities, academic competitiveness on the campus, whether students had considered leaving school, and reactions with whites) and personality orientation (self-concept, racial attitudes and occupational aspirations). The predictive model tested here was derived from hypotheses formed by our systematic review of the literature on black student academic achievement in college.

Table 16

Educational Aspirations by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Educational Aspirations	Total Population	Gender		Campus Race	
		Male	Female	Black	White
B.A. Degree	31.5%	29.7%	32.7%	31.2%	31.8%
M.A. Degree	38.5%	38.2%	38.6%	43.6%	31.7%
J.D. or M.D. Degree	16.7%	19.0%	15.2%	7.8%	28.7%
Ph.D. Degree	13.3%	13.1%	13.4%	17.4%	7.8%
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N =	(1495)	(594)	(901)	(860)	(638)
	Chi Square	= 4.26	p = .235	= 135	p < .001
	Cramer's V	= .053		= .300	

Results from regression anaylsis of academic performance on student background, campus interpersonal relationships and psychological orientation predictors using the total sample are summerized in Table 17 (See Table A-3 for variable intercorrelations, means and standard deviations). Contrary to expectations, student interpersonal relationships on the campus are not significantly correlated with academic performance. Happier, more satisfied students do not necessarily have higher college grade point averages. It is interesting to note how the strong zero-order relationships between college grades and campus interpersonal relations is diminished when other variables (e.g., student background factors) are entered as controls, whether a student's interests are entered as controls. Whether a student's interests are reflected in campus activities, whether she has satisfactory relations with whites and how she perceives academic competition is not strongly predictive of college grades. College grades are correlated with whether a student has considered leaving school (although not significantly so), grades were higher for those students who had not seriously considered leaving school.

Student background factors are strongly realted to student college grades. High schoool grade point average is the strongest predictor of college grades for this sample (partial regression coefficient (B)=.246, $p < .01$). Students whose grades were high in high school are significantly more likely to have college grade point averages. Consistent with our expectation and the preliminary analyses reported above, both gender of student and race of campus are significant predictors of student academic performance in college. College race is the second strongest single predictor of academic performance

Table 17

Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors Total Sample

Predictor Variables	Regression[1] Coefficient	Standard Error	Partial[2] Regression Coefficient
Intercept	1.53	.176**	
Mother's Education	-.002	.004	-.013
High School Grade Average	.227	.027	.246**
Gender	-.058	.029	-.061**
College Race	.206	.033	.187**
Campus Activities	.022	.016	.043
Academic Competition	-.025	.023	-.033
Consider Leaving	.133	.029	.137
Relations with Whites	-.011	.008	-.041
Self-Concept	-.029	.020	-.043
Racial Attitudes	-.003	.014	-.007
Occupational Aspirations	-.001	.001	-.018
Educational Aspirations	.088	.015	.183**

Mutiple R = .394
Multiple R-Square = .155**
Standard Error = .450
N = 1084

* = significant at the .05 level ** = significant at the .01 level

---

[1]In Tables 16-20 and in the discussion of regression results, the term "regression coefficient" refers to the "sample regression weight" or as it is somtimes called, the "raw score regression coefficient." Interested readers may refer to Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973: 22-27; 64-65 for expanded discussion.

[2]In Tables 16-20 and in the discussion of regression results, the term "partial regression coefficient" is used as shorthand for the formal term "standard partial regression coefficient." This coefficient is calculated with all variables in the equation in standard score form and where the effects of all variables other than the one to which the weight applies are held constant. (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973: 64-65).

(B = .187, $p < .01$) while student gender is also strongly predictive of grades (B = - .061, $p < .05$). Students on black campuses and males were significantly more likely to report higher college grades.

For the most part student academic performance was not significantly related to personally orientation in these data. This finding came as a surprise, we had expected students with high self-concept, strong race consciousness and high occupational goals to have better grades. The one exception to this pattern is provided by the strong correlation between college grades and student educational aspirations. The grades of students with high educational aspirations were significantly higher educational aspirations were significantly higher (B = .183, $p < .01$). To the extent that students set high educational goals for the future, their current academic performance seemed to be consistent.

It is instructive at this point to be reminded of the relatively low overall explanatory power of the proposed model. Together the predictors in our regression equation account for a modest 16 per cent of the total variance in student college grades (multiple R-Square = .155, $p < .01$). The persistent importance of student gender and college race in the determination of academic performance also needs to be noted. Gurin and Epps (1975) and Fleming (1984) both argue strongly for models which assess the contextual effects of student gender, student race and campus setting on black student college outcomes. This argument is echoed in recent research by Thomas (1985). In response it seemed useful to test our predictive model's explanatory significance for the four different student sex/campus race subgroups in these data (i.e., black male/white campus; black female/white campus; black male/black campus; black female/black campus).

In comparing the predictive efficacy of the proposed model, we note an interesting paradox, the model's best and worst predictive fits are for black students on white campuses. Twenty-two per cent of the variance in college grades for black males on white campuses and 13 per cent of the variance in black female grades on white campuses is accounted for by variables in the model (Tables 18 and 21). These figures are to be compared with the 14 per cent of variance in black female grades on black campuses (Tables 19 and 20). Interestingly the model best explains the academic performance of black males who attend predominantly white institutions and of black females who attend black institutions. The relatively modest explanatory power of the model across subgroups argues strongly for the model's expansion or redefinition in order to include other factors that influence student grade point average.

Continuing with or comparison of student sex/campus race subgroups we see that psychological factors (self-concept, racial attitudes and occupational aspirations) are for the most part poorly correlated with student academic performance. Educational aspiration is, however, consistently and significantly related to college grades. In all subgroups educational aspirations are higher where student academic performance is higher. For each subgroup, except black females on white campuses, high school grades are significantly correlated with college grades. Students who did well in high school continued to do well in college; the fact that this pattern is broken for females on white campuses poses a quandry. For black students on white campuses, whether they had considered leaving school is also significant. Students who had seriously considered leaving school reported significantly lower grades in college.

In sum, the grades of black males on white campuses (Table 18) are higher if they did well academically in high school ($B = .317^{*}$, $p < .01$), if they had not seriously considered leaving college ($B = .228$, $p < .01$) and if they report high educational goals ($B = .197$, $p < .01$). The profile of a high achieving black female on a white campus (Table 19) reveals her to have high educational aspirations for the future ($B = .177$, $p < .01$) and to not have seriously considered leaving college ($B = .208$, $p < .01$). Positive relations with whites on the campus were also strongly associated with high grades for black females on white campuses ($B = -.108$, $p = .058$).

On black campuses (Table 20), males with higher grades performed better in high school ($B = .23$, $p < .01$) and had higher educational aspirations for the future ($B = .196$, $p < .01$). There was also somewhat the tendency for males who were more involved in campus activities ($B = .10$, $p = .12$) to have higher grades. On black campuses female high achievers were those who had grades in high school ($B = .364$, $p < .01$) and who set high educational goals for the future ($B = .148$, $p < .01$.

Table 18

Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Black Males on White Campuses

Predictor Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Partial Regression Coefficient
Intercept	1.62	.378**	
Mother's Education	-.006	.008	-.056
High School Grade Average	.245	.058	.317**
Campus Activities	.029	.040	.058
Academic Competition	-.027	.064	-.033
Consider Leaving	.205	.069	.288**
Relations with Whites	-.008	.019	-.035
Self-Concept	-.022	.047	-.037
Racial Attitudes	-.028	.032	-.067
Occupational Aspirations	-.001	.002	-.028
Educational Aspirations	.090	.035	.197**

Multiple R = .470
Multiple R-Square = .221**
Standard Error = .394
N = 171

* = significant at the .05 level ** = significant at the .01 level

Table 19

Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Black Females on White Campuses

Predictor Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Partial Regression Coefficient
Intercept	2.102	.312**	
Mother's Education	-.004	.007	-.029
High School Grade Average	.079	.060	.075
Campus Activities	-.012	.035	-.020
Academic Competition	.055	.054	.058
Consider Leaving	.214	.058	.208**
Relations with Whites	-.036	.019	-.108
Self-Concept	-.046	.041	-.065
Racial Attitudes	-.013	.026	-.029
Occupational Aspirations	-.001	.002	-.024
Educational Aspirations	.096	.031	.177**

Multiple R = .362
Multiple R-Square = .131**
Standard Error = .464
N = 316

* = significant at the .05 level ** = significant at the .01 level

Table 20

Regression of Academic Performance on
Predictors: Black Males on Black Campuses

Predictor Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Partial Regression Coefficient
Intercept	2.01	.328**	
Mother's Education	.000	.007	.001
High School Grade Average	.195	.053	.230**
Campus Activities	.053	.034	.100
Academic Competition	-.069	.046	-.094
Consider Leaving	.097	.061	.101
Relationships with Whites	.002	.015	.008
Self-Concept	-.061	.044	-.088
Racial Attitudes	.014	.032	.027
Occupational Aspirations	-.001	.002	-.042
Educational Aspirations	.092	.029	.196**

Multiple R = .371
Multiple R-Square = .138**
Standard Error = .458
N = 256

* = significant at the .01 level *** = significant at the .01 level

Table 21

Regression of Academic Performance on Predictors: Black Females on Black Campuses

Predictor Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Partial Regression Coefficient
Intercept	1.339	.266**	
Mother's Education	-.001	.007	-.008
High School Grade Average	.354	.050	.364**
Campus Activities	.033	.029	.064
Academic Competition	-.020	.036	-.030
Consider Leaving	.044	.053	.046
Relationships with Whites	-.009	.013	-.038
Self-Concept	.013	.035	.020
Racial Attitudes	.019	.026	.041
Occupational Aspirations	.001	.002	.020
Educational Aspirations	.067	.025	.148**

Multiple R = .420
Multiple R-Square = .176**
Standard Error = .458
N = 341

* = significant at the .05 level

** = significant at the .01 level

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

With the precipitous increase in black postsecondary enrollments and the redistribution of black students to white campuses have come many questions about the status of Black Americans in higher education. Of particular interest are questions concerning the similarities and differences between black students who attend traditionally black universities or colleges versus those who attend predominantly white schools. Among the more important questions to ask is whether these students are characterized by comparable family and high school backgrounds? How do the experiences of these students on their respective campuses compare? Is there reason to believe that the education received by black students who attend white schools is superior to that received by black students who attend black schools? Questions such as these and others motivated this study's comparison of the characteristics, experiences and outcomes of black students in U.S. higher education.

This study provides much useful information on the characteristics, experiences and outcomes of black students in U.S. higher education. Descriptive analyses reveal many important differences between black and white campuses; for example, on white campuses, black students complain of frequent racial discrimination. They characterize the general state of campus race relations as poor, although a majority claim satisfactory personal relations with whites. Overall these students' adjustments to college life seem awkward and generally unsatisfying; most report little or no integration into the general campus life. Nevertheless, black students on white campuses voice very high educational and occupational aspirations.

On traditionally black campuses students report lower family socio-economic backgrounds. Their vocational and educational aspirations, while high, are lower than for peers attending white institutions. On black campuses the students report more satisfying adjustment to college life and more cordial relations with faculty and staff. As one would expect, reports of race discrimination on the campus were nearly nonexistent, this despite the ample presence of whites and other race students, faculty and staff in the university. On both black and white campuses, black students experience dramatic drops in academic performance levels compared with their grades in high school. However, the drop is less dramatic for students on black campuses and for males.

Tests of specific research hypotheses revealed the following to be true with respect to student outcomes:

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, as measured by grades, was significantly higher for males and for students on black campuses. Students who report higher grades also report greater satisfaction with and involvement in college life. Neither occupational aspirations, racial attitudes nor student self-concept level are significantly correlated with student grades. However, grades are significantly higher for students who report the highest educational aspirations.

STUDENT RACIAL ATTITUDES show women to be more conservative than males. For example, black women were more strongly opposed to interracial dating than black men. Blacks who are more satisfied with and involved in campus life are also less radical in their racial attitudes.

Socioeconomic status background does not differentiate students on this dimension; well-to-do students are not necessarily more conservative in their racial attitudes.

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH COLLEGE is greater for males and for students on black campuses. Males are significantly more likely to feel a part of the general campus life. The same holds true for students attending traditionally black institutions. On the matter of whether the student had considered dropping out of school, men and women did not differ substantially; however, students on black campuses are significantly more likely to have considered the idea. Males and students on black campuses report significantly more favorable relations with white faculty and staff on their campuses. While students from high socioeconomic status backgrounds are significantly more likely to feel a part of campus life, they are also more likely to report negative relations with white faculty and staff.

SEX AND CAMPUS RACE EFFECTS are substantial and revealing. The educational attainment of mothers is significantly higher for black students on white campuses. The high school academic superiority of females and students on white campuses is incontestable. Just as incontestable are student differences in college major field--women are significantly underrepresented in the "hard sciences". Although the professions attract a disproportionate share of majors on both race campuses, students on black campuses are overwhelmingly concentrated in professional studies programs.

Student differences are also apparent in perceptions of the levels of academic competition on campus, females and students attending white schools report considerably more competition. Interestingly enough, these same two

categories of students are significantly more likely to report negative relations with white faculty and staff on their campuses. While there are no noteworthy gender differences in self-esteem levels, students on white campuses report significantly higher self-esteem.

Looking ahead to the future, students on white campuses and males report significantly higher occupational aspirations. However, black students on black campuses report career striving goals or plans to pursue eminence in their chosen occupations which are substantially higher than those for students on white campuses. Differences in educational aspirations seem more a matter of focus than intensity, males and students on white campuses are more likely to aspire to M.D. or J.D. degrees.

MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULTS for the total sample reveal high school grade point average to be the strongest predictor of college grades. Students with the higher grades in high school also report higher grades in college. Students on black campuses are also most likely to report higher grades. Finally, we see clear evidence for the supposition that student academic performance in college will be highest where students are happier and more satisfied with college life.

When multivariate relationships are examined separately for the four different campus race-student gender subgroups, we see that high school grade point average is the strongest predictor of college grades for all subgroups except black females on white campuses. For black women on white campuses, satisfaction with college is especially predictive of academic performance; thoughts of leaving school and negative relations with faculty/staff significantly depressed their grades. Whether the student had considered leaving

school is also a strong predictor of college grades for black males on white campuses. On black campuses, how much a part of campus life the student felt is strongly predictive of grades; students with higher grades identified more closely with the university.

Interpretation of Findings

The "person-in-the-social setting" perspectives that undergird this research (symbolic interactionist theory and the social structure and personality perspective) provide a useful orienting framework for the study. Characteristics of the individual, most notably race and gender, do indeed influence experiences and outcomes in higher education. The college experiences of black students are also influenced by the institutional setting.

Central in the determination of how individual and institutional characteristics influence black student experiences in higher education are students, interpersonal relationships. Interpersonal relationships form the bridge between individual dispositions and institutional tendencies, together these factors determine student outcomes. The way a student perceives and responds to events in the college setting will differentiate the college experience. What she does when confronted with difficult subject matter or how she handles the uncertainty of being a freshman, will determine whether the experience is positive or negative in its consequences. It must be further noted that how other actors in the college setting perceive and respond to the student can also make a difference. What the teacher of that difficult computer engineering class does or how the resident dormitory

advisor for freshmen behaves influences the eventual outcomes for the student. In short, the multiple possible outcomes for a black student--for any student--in a particular academic situation will vary in accordance with that individual's personality and behaviors, the institutional or situational context, and the dynamic interpersonal relationships between that student and other key actors in the situational setting.

Black student college outcomes can be reasonably viewed as resulting from a two-stage process. Taking the case of academic performance to illustrate this point and the theoretical model implicit in this conceptualization, we are led to conclude the following. Whether a student successfully completes college and whether that student graduates with "Honors" is no doubt partly influenced by individual characteristics. How bright the student is, the level of background preparation, the intensity of personal ambition and striving will all influence academic performance outcomes. Beyond these personal traits, however, is a set of more general factors-characteristics more situational and interpersonal in nature. The student's academic performance will also be affected by the quality of life at the institution, the level of academic competition, university rules/procedure/resources and relationships with faculty.

In discussing the aspiration--attainment process nearly twenty years ago, Rehberg and Westby (1967) introduced the vital notion of facilitation. The concept is useful here for its focus on the fact that the attainment process is influenced by a combination of institutional, individual and interactional factors. The educational goals and activities of black students are acted out in specific social environments which affect not only their content, but their

possibilities for realization as well. Actors in the setting, indeed the setting itself, can either facilitate or frustrate the efforts of black students to achieve high academic performance (Allen, 1980).

We have seen ample evidence of differential patterns of the facilitation/frustration of black student goal setting and goal achievement in college. Females, because of their socialization, self-perceptions and how others perceive them, are commonly restricted in their aspirations and grades. Black students on black campuses are commonly assisted in feeling good about themselves and about their places in the university community. When personal background characteristics, campus experiences and student personality traits are examined, we see more clearly the factors that facilitate black student academic performance in college, we also better understand the factors that frustrate black student academic performance in college.

Implications: An Agenda for Action

The challenge confronting interested researchers, educators and policy makers today is to identify factors and formulate strategies which will improve the educational experiences and outcomes of black students in U. S. higher education. In seeking answers to the wide range of complex questions, it is helpful to turn to the students themselves. When asked to suggest new programs or policies which would deal with the problems experienced by black students who attend white universities, our sample of black students on white campuses typically responded as follows:

"A policy to eliminate the ongoing conspiracy to undermine and eventually destroy black/Minority support services."

"Increase, not reduce financial aid."

"Implement an effective system of dealing with racist instructors."

"Sponsor and encourage more black relevant social functions."

"Increase effectiveness and support of black/Minority support organizations, consortium programs."

Black students on white campuses seem to cry out for more supportive conditions under which to pursue their education. To the extent that these students can feel less "under siege", the quality of their educational experiences and educational outcomes will be vastly improved. It should come as no surprise that student educational development is negatively affected where they are treated as aliens and feel their every movement carefully scrutinized for evidence to support the assumption that "black students really don't belong at this university."

Black students on black campuses also offered recommendations for improving their college experience, among the typical responses:

"instructors did not talk to the students, they talked at them (degraded the students, intimidated). Instructors are there for their benefit and not yours."

"Poor living condition, not impressed with students or some faculty. School does not promote a learning environment. I felt less than human."

"Lack of resources, poor administration."

"Poor living and feeding conditions. No student rights, harsh rules and regulations, unorganized faculty and administration."

"Predominantly black environment, lack of university activities, and all the unnecessary -------- the university put me through."

On black campuses, students in this sample also cried out for more supportive conditions under which to pursue their education. Predictably, where the physical plant was deteriorating, where the day to day operation of the university was inefficient and where the intellectual energy of a campus was weak, students found it difficult to derive maximum benefit.

Life is full of choices and tradeoffs. This point is forcefully made by our comparisons between black and white campuses. In the case of black campuses, black students purchase psychological well-being and spiritual affinity at the cost of less than favorable physical circumstances. In the case of white campuses, black students purchase richly endowed physical circumstances and bureaucratic efficiency at the cost of less than favorable interpersonal relations and peace of mind. In a variation on these themes, black women are forced to choose between self-assertion and male companionship or between the pursuit of non-traditional careers and personal happiness. These are unfair, unnecessary, choices bred from our society's historic institutionalization of inequities by race, gender and class. Until these inequities are attacked at their source, black students in higher education--indeed the entire educational process at this level--will continue to suffer.

The ideal goal of educational change for black students in higher education over the coming years, should be to combine the better qualities of black and white campuses. The day must come when black students can find on both white and black campuses equal portions of "feel good" and "do good." Students should be able to find on both race campuses adequate computer facilities and adequate numbers of concerned instructors; both celebration of their racial identity and bureaucratic efficiency; both tastefully appointed

dormitory rooms and a sense of belonging. It goes without saying that comparable goals must be sought on behalf of black female students. Women should be able to major in microbiology and to have a love life; they should be a part of campus activities and maintain their stellar records of academic performance from high school. In short, the call is for the creation of beneficial learning environments which do not penalize students for their race, gender or class status.

I am mindful of the fact that these changes will require the fundamental reorganization of U.S. higher education as it regards Black Americans. Notions about the appropiate purpose and approaches of higher education will need to be reassessed and where necessary, altered. As my contribution to this vital regenerative process I offer the following specific recommendations:

1. **PRECOLLEGE ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS** have been used to good advantage in correcting educational inequities that carry over from high school and by so doing assign automatic disadvantages to black students (especially black females). Universities are encouraged to institute or expand programs which bring students to their campuses for short term summer institutes, for periodic courses during the junior and senior years of high school, and so on. The purposes of such programs are to expose prospective students at an early stage to the requirements, expectations and procedures of higher education.

2. **BETTER COORDINATION BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES** would also help to improve the educational experiences of black students in college. Expanded contacts between university personnel and high school counselors, teachers and administrators would greatly assist the process of communicating

the specifics of what the university expects in an adequately prepared entering student. These contacts would also allow universities to anticipate areas of strength and weakness among entering students.

3. **COACHING FOR STANDARDIZED TESTS** would also assist the preparation of black students for higher education. Recognizing the fact of average lower scores for black students on national achievement tests, high schools, churches and universities are encouraged to organized preparatory courses.

4. **EARLY ADMISSION AND FINANCIAL AID** notification programs will also facilitate the postsecondary educational process for black students. Promising students need to be identified early and given ample financial aid in order to encourage their entry into the university.

5. **SYSTEMATIC ORIENTATION** programs for incoming black students are essential in order to ease the transition from high school to college. Ideally, such programs should include both general and specific components (i.e., specific to black students) intended to acquaint students with the essentials of successful college life.

6. **BETTER COORDINATION OF UNIVERSITY SERVICES AND FOLLOW THROUGH** will also enhance the educational experiences of black students in higher education. The various offices serving a students' needs must strive for better coordination to avoid working at cross-purposes. Similarly, systematic follow-ups will insure that fewer students "drop between the cracks" or receive help only after problems have reached crisis proportions. All such activities need to be organized in a "retention" system intended to insure that black students who are admitted are retained and successfully matriculated.

7. **FACULTY MEMBERS** are key factors in the process of enhancing the higher education experience for black students. They represent the institution's "human link" with students, seeing them on a sustained, daily basis. Thus faculty need to be sensitized to their critical role and encouraged to assume wider responsibility in aiding student adjustment to college.

8. **INCREASING THE PRESENCE OF BLACKS, ESPECIALLY BLACK FEMALES** on university campuses in meaningful ways among students, faculty, staff and curriculum content is critical. Blacks, and black female students in particular, need to feel validated by the universities which they attend. By the same token, non-black and male members of the university community need to develop a better appreciation for black and black female concerns.

9. **VALUE-ADDED RATHER THAN WASH-OUT TEACHING PHILOSOPHIES** must come to dominate at universities. The institutional ethnic must shift away from an academic form of Social Darwinism or "survival of the fittest" to one where the approach is more individualized and intended to assist students in correcting identified inadequacies. Unfortunately the tendency has developed in many institutions of higher education to equate academic excellence with academic casualties. The assumption being that the more students flunked out of a particular program the stronger that program must be academically.

10. **COMMITMENT TO POSITIVE AND EFFECTIVE CHANGE** must become a central goal on the nation's campuses. This will require that the goal of equity in education be reasserted. In the midst of an increasingly conservative, retrogressive national mood and the problems of economic downturn, the goals of educational equity for black, other minorities and women have fallen into disrepute. A renewed commitment to achieving these goals will be required.

As I conclude this report, I am reminded of a significant study by Ogbu (1975) comparing minority education cross-culturally in six countries (Japan, Israel, the United States, Britain, New Zealand, and India). His data reveal similarities in the negative myths about, and the inferior educational opportunities provided, disadvantaged groups. The effect of this pattern was to "institutionalize" the low status of discriminated groups and by so doing to perpetuate their low educational attainment. Education is a valued social resource, thus its allocation will be subject to the dynamics of power in any society. In the U.S., prevailing views of blacks, other minorities, women and the poor have encouraged definition of them as uneducable, poorly motivated, low achievers. These views have reinforced (and been reinforced by) their concentration in society's low prestige occupations, low income neighborhoods and low educational achievement categories.

If we are to improve the situations of black, female, minority and poor students in U.S. higher education, we must associate this effort with the need for radical shifts in the value structure and power distribution of the society. For as long as white, upper-class, males exercise virtually uncontested power over society's institutions, these institutions will likely reflect values, goals and organizational patterns suited to their ends. To the extent that this continues to be true, those excluded "others" (i.e., blacks, women, the poor and other minorities) will continue to be denied equal access to society's resources. They will continue to be denied any substantive role in societal decisionmaking.

It all boils down to a power quotient: the society and its institutions have proven to be most responsive to the groups that are best able to enforce accountability. As one means to achieve the necessary shift in the balance of

societal power, the number of black students in higher education (on both white and black campuses) must be increased. At the same time, we must achieve substantial improvements in the quality of education (i.e., performance levels, calibre of fields selected, college satisfaction, etc.) that the U.S. system of higher education provides for black students. If we can graduate more black students who are trained to emphasize individual excellence and a sense of collective responsibility, the black community--and society as a whole--will benefit. Through the efforts of this new breed of corporate executives, government officials, school teachers, health specialists, engineers and other professionals, positive change in how this society does its business on a daily basis can be achieved. They can help to make our society and its institutions more humane.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, Elizabeth A.
1976 Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education: An Assessment, Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Allen, Walter R.
1985 "Black Student, White Campus: Structural, Interpersonal and Psychological Correlates of Success." Journal of Negro Education. 54(2): 134-147.

1984 "Race Consciousness and Collective Commitments Among Black Students on White Campuses." Western Journal of Black Studies. 8(3): 156-166.

1982 "Black and Blue: Black Students at the University of Michigan." LSA Magazine 6 (1): 13-17. Ann Arbor: Dean's Office, College of Literature, Science and the Arts at the University of Michigan.

1980 "Prelude to Attainment: Race, Sex and Student Achievement Orientations." The Sociological Quarterly, 21 (Winter): 65-79.

Anderson, James D.
1984 "The Schooling and Achievement of Black Children: Before and After Brown v. Topeka, 1900-1980." Advances in Motivation and Achievement. 1: 103-122.

Astin, Alexander W.
1982 Minorities in American Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, Helen and Patricia H. Cross.
1981 "Black Students in White Institutions." In Gail E. Thomas (Ed.) Black Students in Higher Education in the 1970's, pp. 30-45. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Ballard, A.B.
1973 The Education of Black Folk: The Afro-American Struggle for Knowledge in White America. New York: Harper & Row.

Bayer, A.E.
1972 The Black College Freshman: Characteristics and Recent Trends. Washington, D.C.:American Council on Education Research Reports, Volume 7 (3).

Billingsley, Andrew
1981 "The Case for Black Colleges." Essence (August): 124.

Blackwell, James E.
1982 "Demographics of Desegregation." Pp. 28-70 in Reginald Wilson (Ed.) Race and Equity in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Blackwell, James E.
1981 Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professonals. Bayside, New York: General Hall, Inc.

Blumer, Herbert.
1969 Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Boyd, William M.
1974 Desegregating America's Colleges: A Nationwide Survey of Black Students, 1972-73. New York: Praeger.

Boyd, William M.
1981 "The Forgotten Side of the Black Undergraduate: An Assessment of Academic Achievements and Aspirations During the 1970's." In Gail E. Thomas (Ed.) Black Students in Higher Education in the 1970's, pp. 142-151. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Braddock, Jomills
1981 "The Major Field Choices and Occupational Career Orientations of Black and White College Students." Pp.167-184. In Gail E. Thomas (Ed.) Black Students in Higher Education in the 1970's. Westport,
Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Braddock, Jomills and M.P. Dawkins
1981 "Predicting Black Academic Achievement in Higher Education." Journal of Negro Education (Summer): 319-325.

Centra, J.A., R. Linn, and M. Parry
1970 "Academic Growth in Predominantly Negro and Predominantly White Colleges." American Educational Research Journal 7: 83-98.

Deskins, Donald R. Jr.
1983 Minority Recruitment Data: An Analysis of Baccalaureate Degree Production in the U.S.. Totawa, New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld.

1981 "Minority Recruitment Data: A Preliminary Report." Rackham Reports 7 (2): 1-5. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan

DiCesare, P.C., W.E. Sellacek and G.C. Brooks
1972 "Nonintellective Correlates of Black Student Attrition." Journal of College Student Personnel 13: 319-324.

English, R.A. and T.J. Settle
1976 "Minority Students in Higher Education." Integrated Education 14 (3): (May-June) 48-57.

Fleming, Jacqueline
1984 Blacks In College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

1981A "Stress and Satisfaction in the College Years of Black Students." Journal of Negro Education (Summer): 307-318.

1981B "Special Needs of Blacks and Other Minorities." In Arthur Chickering (Ed.) The Modern American College, pp. 279-295. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gurin, Patricia and Edgar G. Epps
1975 Black Consciousness, Identity and Achievement: A Study of Students in Historically Black Colleges. New York: Wiley Press.

Hall, Marcia, A. Mays and W. Allen.
1984 "Dreams Deferred: Black Student Career Goals and Fields of Study in Graduate/Professional Schools. Phylon, 45(4): 271-283.

Hall, Marcia and Walter Allen.
1982 "Race Consciousness and Achievement: Two Issues In The Study of Black Graduate/Professional Students." Integrateducation 20(1-2): 56-61.

Haynes III, Leonard
1981 "The Adams Mandate: A Format for Achieving Equal Educational Opportunity and Attainment." Pp. 329-395. In Gail Thomas (Ed.) Black Students in Higher Education in the 70's, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Hedegard, J.M. and D.R. Brown
1969 "Encounters of Some Negro and White Freshmen with Public Multiversity." Journal of Social Issues 25 (3): 131-144.

Huber, Joan
1973 "Symbolic Interaction As A Pragmatic Perspective: The Bias of Emergent Theory." American Sociological Review 38: 274-284.

House, James S.
1981 "Social Structure and Personality." In Morris Rosenberg and Ralph H. Turner (Ed.) Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives. New York: Basic Books.

Keith, L.
1972 "Issues Facing Black Students and Faculty at Predominantly White Institutions." Journal of Afro-American Issues 1: 69-73.

Kerlinger, Fred and E. Pedhazur
1973 Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Miller, Carroll
1981 "Higher Education for Black Americans: Problems and Issues." Journal of Negro Education (Summer): 208-224.

Morris, Lorenzo
1979 Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education. Washington D.C.: Howard University Press.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders
1968 National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders Report. New York: Bantam.

National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities
1980 Still a Lifeline: The Status of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, 1975-1978. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics
1984 The Traditionally Black Institutions of Higher Education, 1860 to 1982. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

1982 Fall Enrollment in Colleges and Universities, 1980 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, (June).

Nettles, Michael, C. Gosman, A. Thoeny and B. Dandrige
1985 The Causes and Consequences of College Students' Attrition Rates, Progression Rates and Grade Point Averages. Nashville, Tennessee: Higher Education Commission.

Ogbu, John U.
1978 Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Pearson, Willie and L.C. Pearson
1985 "Baccalaureate Origins of Black American Scientists: Cohort Analysis." Journal of Negro Education. 54: 24-34.

Pentages, Timothy J. and Carol F. Creedon
1978 "Studies of College Attrition: 1950-1975." Review of Educational Research 48: 49-101.

Peterson, Marvin, R. T. Blackburn, Z. F. Gamson, C. H. Arce, R. W. Davenport and J. R. Mingle
1978 Black Students on White Campuses: The Impacts of Increased Black Enrollments. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Ramist, Leonard and Solomon Arbeiter
1984 Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1983. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Reed, R.J.
1979 "Increasing the Opportunities for Black Students in Higher Education." Journal of Negro Education 47 (2): 189-203.

Rehberg, Richard and David Westby
1967 "Parental Encouragement, Occupation Education and Family Size: Artifactual or Independent Determinants of Adolescent Educational Expectations." Social Forces 45: 362-373.

Rosser, J.M.
1972 "Higher Education and Black Americans: An Overview." Journal of Afro-American Issues 1 (2): 189-203.

Smith, A. Wade and Walter R. Allen
1984 "Modeling Black Student Academic Performance in Higher Education." Research in Higher Education. 21(2): 210-225.

Smith, Jeff
1981 The Impact of Desegregation on Higher Education. Durham: Institute on Desegregation, North Carolina University.

Thomas, Gail E.
1984 Black College Students and Factors Influencing Their Major Field Choice. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

1981 Black Students in Higher Education: Conditions and Experiences in the 1970's. Westport, Connecticut. Greenwood Press.

1978 Equality of Representation of Race and Sex Groups in Higher Education: Institutional and Program Enrollment Statuses. Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Report No. 263 (October).

Thomas, Gail E., James M. McPartland and Denise C. Gotfredson
1980 The Status of Desegregation and Black-White Participation in Higher Education. Baltimore, Md. Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Report No. 598.

Webster, D.W., W.E. Sedlacek and J. Miyares
1979 "A Comparison of Problems Perceived by Minority and White University Students." Journal of College Student Personnel 20 (2): 165-170.

Wells, Alan (Ed.)
1978 Contemporary Sociological Theories. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc.

Williams, Carole A.
1981 The Black/White College: Dismantling the Dual System of Higher Education. Washington, D.C. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Clearinghouse Publication #66.

Willie, C.V. and A.S. McCord
1972 Black Students at White Colleges. New York: Praeger.

APPENDIX

1. Table A-1. Percentage Distributions for Study Variables by Student Gender and Campus Race

2. Table A-2. Percentage Distributions for Study Variables by The Four Student Gender/Campus Race Subgroups

3. Table A-3. Correlation Matrix of Variables in Study; Means and Standard Deviations

4. National Study of Black College Students Research Collaborators and Advisory Committee Members

5. Study Questionnaires

Table A-1
Percentage Distributions for Study Variables by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Study Variables	Stratification Variables: Gender		Campus Race	
	Male	Female	White	Black
Mother's Education[1]				
1-8 years	12.7%	10.4%	11.4%	11.3%
9-11 years	15.2%	18.1%	13.2%	19.8%
H.S. Grad	35.2%	35.1%	45.1%	27.3%
Some College	11.1%	11.2%	0.3%	19.7%
B.A. Degree	16.2%	14.5%	18.7%	12.4%
M.S.W., M.B.A.,M.A.	8.5%	8.9%	9.9%	7.9%
Ph.D., M.D., J.D.	1.0%	1.9%	1.5%	1.5%
N	597	912	659	852
Family Income[2]				
$0 - 12,000	31.2%	37.5%	32.6%	36.7%
$12,001 - 21,000	24.1%	21.4%	22.3%	22.7%
$21,001 - 40,000	31.4%	27.3%	31.8%	26.8%
$41,001 - 150,000 plus	13.4%	13.8%	13.4%	13.8%
N	590	869	629	833
High School G.P.A.[3]				
1.00 (D) - 2.49 (C-)	13.9%	7.4%	4.1%	15.0%
2.50 (C) - 2.99 (C+)	27.0%	19.4%	15.9%	27.8%
3.00 (B) - 3.49 (B)	32.8%	37.5%	31.5%	39.2%
3.50 (B+) - 4.00 (A)	26.3%	35.6%	48.5%	17.9%
N	540	834	629	747
Current Major[4]				
Natural Sciences	11.0%	7.5%	9.8%	8.1%
Traditional Professions	55.6%	47.7%	42.9%	57.1%
NonTraditional Professions	9.4%	13.6%	8.4%	14.8%
Social Sciences	18.4%	20.5%	23.8%	16.3%
Humanities	4.3%	6.5%	9.1%	2.9%
Undecided	1.3%	4.2%	6.0%	0.7%
N	608	933	681	863
Undergraduate G.P.A.[5]				
1.00 (D) - 2,49 (C-)	28.0%	34.1%	36.4%	28.0%
2.50 (C) - 2.99 (C+)	40.4%	37.4%	39.2%	38.2%
3.00 (B) - 3.49 (B)	24.7%	23.1%	20.7%	26.1%
3.50 (B+) - 4.00 (A)	6.9%	5.4%	3.7%	7.8%
N	607	888	653	844
Consider Leaving University[6]				
Yes	35.8%	37.3%	33.0%	39.7%
No	64.2%	62.7%	67.0%	60.3%
N	614	943	691	869

Table A-1 (Continued)
Percentage Distributions for Study Variables by
Student Gender and Campus Race

Study Variables	Stratification Variables: Gender		Campus Race	
	Male	Female	White	Black
Feel Part of Campus Life[7]				
Not At All	13.8%	14.4%	19.4%	10.0%
A Little	29.8%	33.8%	42.7%	24.1%
Some What	37.0%	35.2%	30.4%	40.1%
Considerably	19.4%	16.6%	7.5%	25.7%
N	624	944	684	887
Level of Academic Competition [8]				
Low	6.5%	8.4%	0.9%	13.0%
Average	49.8%	42.3%	38.0%	51.0%
High	43.6%	49.4%	61.1%	36.0%
N	612	927	689	853
Relations with Whites Index[9]				
Excellent	20.6%	15.7%	8.5%	24.9%
Very Good	60.9%	63.5%	64.5%	60.8%
Good	7.7%	9.0%	12.1%	5.5%
Poor	10.5%	11.3%	14.5%	8.2%
Very Poor	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%
N	612	932	692	855
Relations with White Faculty[10]				
Excellent	23.9%	19.4%	15.3%	26.2%
Good	62.5%	67.4%	67.7%	63.4%
Poor	12.0%	11.2%	15.2%	8.5%
Very Poor	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%
N	590	901	691	803
Relations with White Staff[10]				
Excellent	20.3%	15.0%	12.3%	26.6%
Good	61.2%	68.6%	67.9%	63.5%
Poor	16.0%	13.3%	16.5%	12.3%
Very Poor	2.5%	3.2%	3.4%	2.6%
N	526	849	685	693
Relations with White Students[10]				
Excellent	27.2%	22.5%	23.7%	24.9%
Good	61.4%	65.7%	63.8%	64.0%
Poor	10.1%	9.4%	10.9%	8.7%
Very Poor	1.2%	2.4%	1.6%	2.4%
N	562	871	688	748

Table A-1 (Continued)

Study Variables	Gender		Campus Race	
	Male	Female	White	Black
Racial Attitudes Index[11]				
No Black Consciousness	2.1%	2.0%	2.6%	1.6%
A Little Black Consciousness	11.7%	12.1%	13.9%	10.4%
Some Black Consciousness	31.7%	30.0%	30.2%	31.1%
High Black Consciousness	37.7%	38.8%	37.1%	39.2%
Very High Black Consciousness	16.8%	17.2%	16.2%	17.7%
N	618	944	692	872
Need Black National Party[12]				
Agree	76.3%	77.6%	72.3%	81.0%
Disagree	23.7%	22.4%	27.7%	19.0%
N	608	926	675	861
Interracial Dating Acceptable[13]				
Agree	46.2%	37.7%	40.9%	41.3%
Disagree	28.7%	62.3%	59.1%	58.7%
N	611	930	682	860
Church helped Blacks[14]				
Agree	71.3%	69.3%	79.3%	62.7%
Disagree	28.7%	30.7%	20.7%	37.3%
N	613	928	682	860
Unity Among Black Students[15]				
Agree	57.3%	51.9%	44.1%	61.9%
Disagree	42.7%	48.1%	55.9%	38.1%
N	609	934	682	862
Future Occupational Aspirations[16]				
Low (60)	10.8%	15.8%	15.5%	12.5%
Average (70)	33.3%	35.2%	33.0%	35.7%
High (85)	34.3%	33.2%	25.0%	40.2%
Very High (85+)	21.5%	15.7%	26.4%	11.6%
N	594	903	651	848
Educational Aspirations[17]				
B.A.	29.6%	32.7%	31.8%	31.2%
M.A., M.S.W., M.B.A.	38.2%	38.6%	31.7%	43.6%
J.D., M.D.	19.0%	15.2%	28.7%	7.8%
Ph.D.	13.1%	13.4%	7.8%	17.4%
N	594	901	638	860

Table A-1 (Continued)

Study Variables	Stratification Variables: Gender		Campus Race	
	Male	Female	White	Black
When Consider Self Successful in Occupation[18]				
Enough to stay in	4.5%	6.7%	4.1%	7.1%
As well as average	3.2%	4.4%	3.5%	4.2%
Little better than average	5.8%	11.8%	11.4%	7.9%
Much better than average	23.2%	52.9%	29.5%	19.3
Top in occupation	63.3%	52.9%	51.5%	61.4%
N	600	905	651	856
Respondent's Self Concept[19]				
Below Average	0.5%	0.3%	0.7%	0.1%
Average	19.2%	20.9%	14.3%	24.8%
Above Average	52.8%	51.8%	56.4%	49.0%
High	27.5%	27.0%	28.5%	26.1%
N	615	934	684	866

Table A-2
Percentage Distributions for Study Variables by
the Four Student Gender/Campus Race Subgroups

Gender	Male		Female	
	Campus Race			
Study Variables	White	Black	White	Black
Mother's Education[1]				
1-8 years	10.6%	14.1%	11.8%	9.2%
9-11 years	12.8%	16.8%	13.4%	22.3%
H.S. Grad	45.4%	28.9%	44.9%	26.3%
Some College	0.0%	17.8%	0.5%	20.8%
B.A. Degree	19.8%	14.1%	18.1%	11.3%
M.S.W.,M.B.A., M.A.	10.6%	7.3%	9.5%	8.3%
Ph.D.,M.D.,J.D.	0.9%	1.1%	1.9%	1.9%
N	(227)	(370)	(432)	(480)
Family Income[2]				
$0-12,000	29.1%	32.4%	34.5%	40.2%
$12,001-21,000	23.8%	24.3%	21.4%	21.4%
$21,001-40,000	35.9%	28.6%	29.6%	25.3%
$40,001-150,000 plus	11.2%	14.7%	14.5%	13.2%
N	(223)	(367)	(406)	(463)
High School G.P.A.[3]				
1.00 (D) - 2.49 (C-)	7.4%	18.2%	2.4%	12.4%
2.50 (c) - 2.99 (C+)	20.4%	31.5%	13.6%	25.2%
3.00(B) - 3.49 (B+)	31.9%	33.3%	31.2%	43.7%
3.50 (B+) - 4.00 (A)	40.3%	17.0%	52.8%	18.8%
N	(216)	(324)	(413)	(421)
Current Major[4]				
Natural Sciences	13.2%	9.7%	8.1%	7.0%
Traditional Professions	47.2%	60.9%	40.6%	54.2%
Nontraditonal Professions	6.0%	11.5%	9.6%	17.2%
Social Sciences	23.8%	15.0%	23.8%	17.5%
Humanities	7.2%	2.4%	10.1%	3.3%
Undecided	2.6%	0.5%	7.8%	0.8%
N	(235)	(375)	(446)	(469)
Undergraduate G.P.A.[5]				
1.00 (D) - 2.49 (C-)	29.5%	27.1%	40.3%	28.6%
2.50 (C) - 2.99 (C+)	44.9%	37.5%	36.0%	38.6%
3.00 (B) - 3.49 (B)	23.1%	25.7%	19.3%	26.4%
3.50 (B+) - 4.00 (A)	2.6%	9.7%	4.3%	6.4%
N	(234)	(373)	(419)	(469)

Table A-2 (Continued)

Gender	Male		Female	
	Campus Race			
Study Variables	White	Black	White	Black
Consider Leaving University[6]				
Yes	29.8%	39.6%	34.7%	39.8%
No	70.2%	60.4%	65.3%	60.2%
N	(238)	(376)	(453)	(490)
Feel Part of Campus Life[7]				
Not At All	18.6%	10.9%	19.9%	9.5%
A Litte	38.8%	24.3%	44.7%	23.9%
Some What	31.6%	40.3%	29.8%	40.0%
Considerably	11.0%	24.5%	5.6%	26.5%
N	(237)	(387)	(447)	(497)
Level of Academic Competition[8]				
Low	0.8%	10.2%	0.9%	15.3%
Average	43.1%	54.2%	35.3%	48.8%
High	56.1%	35.7%	63.8%	35.8%
N	(239)	(373)	(450)	(477)
Relations with Whites Index[9]				
Excellent	11.3%	26.6%	7.1%	23.8%
Very Good	62.5%	59.9%	65.5%	61.7%
Good	11.7%	5.1%	12.4%	5.8%
Poor	14.2%	8.1%	14.6%	8.1%
Very Poor	1.7%	1.4%	1.8%	2.2%
N	(240)	(372)	(452)	(480)
Relations with White Faculty[10]				
Excellent	17.9%	28.0%	14.0%	24.9%
Good	65.4%	60.6%	69.0%	65.8%
Poor	15.0%	10.0%	15.3%	7.1%
Very Poor	1.7%	1.4%	1.8%	2.2%
N	(240)	(350)	(451)	(450)
Relations with White Staff[10]				
Excellent	15.7%	24.1%	10.5%	20.0%
Good	63.1%	59.7%	70.4%	66.5%
Poor	10.8%	9.6%	10.0%	7.8%
Very Poor	1.3%	1.2%	1.8%	3.1%
N	(236)	(290)	(449)	(400)

Table A-2 (Continued)

Gender	Male		Female	
	Campus Race			
Study Variables	White	Black	White	Black
Relations with White Students[10]				
Excellent	26.3%	28.0%	22.3%	22.7%
Good	61.7%	61.2%	65.0%	66.4%
Poor	10.8%	9.6%	10.9%	7.8%
Very Poor	1.3%	1.2%	1.8%	3.1%
N	(240)	(322)	(448)	(423)
Racial Attitudes Index[11]				
No Black Consciousness	2.5%	1.8%	2.6%	1.4%
A Little Black Consciousness	14.8%	9.7%	13.4%	10.8%
Some Black Consciousness	34.2%	30.2%	28.1%	31.7%
High Black Consiousness	35.0%	39.4%	38.2%	39.3%
Very High Black Consciousness	13.5%	18.9%	17.6%	16.8%
N	(237)	(381)	(455)	(489)
Need Black National Party[12]				
Agree	71.9%	79.0%	72.5%	82.4%
Disagree	28.1%	21.0%	27.5%	17.6%
N	(231)	(377)	(444)	(482)
Interracial Dating Acceptable[13]				
Agree	48.9%	44.4%	36.7%	38.7%
Disagree	51.1%	55.6%	63.3%	61.3%
N	(235)	(376)	(447)	(483)
Church Helped Blacks[14]				
Agree	78.8%	66.6%	79.6%	59.8%
Disagree	21.2%	33.4%	20.4%	40.2%
N	(236)	(377)	(446)	(482)
Unity Among Black Students[15]				
Agree	43.6%	65.9%	44.4%	58.8%
Disagree	56.4%	34.1%	55.6%	41.2%
N	(234)	(375)	(448)	(486)
Future Occupational Aspirations[16]				
Low (60)	10.6%	10.9%	18.1%	13.8%
Average (70)	29.2%	35.9%	35.1%	35.4%
High (85)	26.5%	39.1%	24.2%	41.2%
Very High (85+)	33.6%	14.1%	22.6%	9.6%
N	(226)	(368)	(425)	(481)

Table A-2 (Continued)

Gender	Male		Female	
	Campus Race			
Study Variables	White	Black	White	Black
Educational Aspirations[17]				
B.A.	29.8%	29.5%	32.9%	32.6%
M.A., M.S.W., M.B.A.	28.0%	44.1%	33.6%	43.0%
J.D.,M.D.	35.3%	9.6%	25.2%	6.4%
Ph.D.	6.9%	16.8%	8.3%	17.9%
N	(218)	(376)	(420)	(481)
When Condsider Self Successful in Occupation[18]				
Enough to stay in	2.7%	5.6%	4.9%	8.4%
As well as average	4.4%	2.4%	3.1%	5.6%
Little better than average	6.2%	5.6%	14.1%	9.8%
Much better than average	29.8%	19.2%	29.3%	19.4%
Top in occuaption	56.9%	67.2%	48.6%	56.8%
N	(225)	(375)	(426)	(479)
Respondent's Self Concept[19]				
Below Average	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%
Average	11.9%	23.7%	15.6%	25.8%
Above Average	54.9%	51.6%	57.6%	46.8%
High	32.3%	24.5%	26.5%	27.4%
N	(235)	(380)	(449)	(485)

Footnotes for Tables A-1 and A-2

1. The exact question was: "Please circle the highest number of years of school completed by each of the following members of your family...Mother..."(Responses to question are noted in table).

2. The exact question was: "From the list below, please circle the number indicating your parents'/guardians' combined income for the previous calender year." Original response choices consisted of 16 income categories ranging from less than $8000 to over $150,000 and have been collapsed in the table.

3. The exact question simply asked, "High School Cumulative Grade Point Average: ___". The open ended responses range from 1.0 - 4.0 and are collapsed in the table.

4. This term was recoded from a series of open ended questions. The first question asked, "What was your major when you first enrolled?" and was followed by "Is this still your major?... yes...no." If no, the respondents were asked, "What is your current major?" Their responses to these questions were grouped into the disciplined noted in the table.

5. The original question was open ended and asked, "your university cumulative grade point average?"

6. In the 1981 study the item read, "have you ever seriously considered dropping out of school?...yes...no." In 1983 the item read, "Have you ever seriously considered leaving this university?...yes...no."

7. This item was, "how much do you, as a black student, feel part of general campus life, insofar as student activities and government are concerned?" Responses to question are noted in table. In the 1983 study the phrase "as a black student" was omitted from this question.

8. In 1981 the question used was, "Do you feel there is intense academic competition here among students?" Response choices were "none = 1", "very little = 2", "some = 3", and "considerable = 4". In 1983 the question used was "how intense would you say the academic competition is at this university?" The response choices were "extremely intense = 5". "intense = 4", "about average = 3", "somewhat intense = 2", and "not at all intense = 1". The following response choices from the 1981 version of the survey make up the categories in the table as noted: "low" = 1; "average" = 2,3; and "high" = 4. For the 1983 survey the items were grouped as followed: "low" = 4,5; "average" = 3; and "high" - 1,2.

Footnotes for Tables A-1 and A-2 (Cont'd)

9. The "Relations with Whites Index" is a simple additive index of the three items in footnote 10: "Relations with white Faculty", "Relations with white Staff", and "Relations with white Students". The index is coded as "Good" = 3-7; "poor" = 8,9,10; and "Very Poor" = 11,12.

10. This item asked, "How would you characterize your relations with whites at this university?" and inquired about "Faculty", "Staff People", and "other Students" seperately (the response choices for each of these groups were "Excellent = 1", "Good = 2", "Poor = 3" and "Very Poor = 4").

11. The "Racial Attitudes Index" is a simple additive index of the items in footnotes 12 through 15. The index ranges from 0 - 4, where "0" = lowest score of black consciousness and "4" = the highest score.

12. Respondents were asked to "strongly agree", "agree", "strongly disagree", or "disagree" with the following statements: There is a need for a national black political party.: ("agree" = 1 and "disagree" = 0 for the index);

13. "Interracial dating and marriage are equally as acceptable as within race dating and marriage" ("agree" = 0 and "disagree" = 1, for the index);

14. "In general, the black church has helped the conditions of black people in this country" ("agree" = 1 and "disagree" = 0 for the index);

15. "There is a great deal of unity and sharing among black students at this university" ("agree" = 1 and "disagree" = 0 for the index). In 1983 the respondents were only given 2 choices "agree" or "disagree".

16. The question asked, "Considering your abilities, personal contacts, the job market, etc., what occupation do you actually expect to go into once your education is completed?" The responses to this question were coded as three digit Duncan prestige scores and collapsed into 4 groups as indicated in the table.

17. The question asked, "Considering your ability, financial situation, societal attitudes, etc., how far do you actually expect to go in school?" Whereas in 1981 this item was open ended, in 1983 the respondents were asked to choose among six responses. The only difference between the categories listed in the table and those provided for respondents in 1983 was the separation of advanced professional and nonprofessional degrees into distinct response choices, and the inclusion of "other" as a response category.

Footnotes for Tables A-1 and A-2 (Cont'd)

18. This item asked, "After you are in the occupation which will be your life's work, when do you think you will be able to consider yourself successful enough so that you can relax and stop trying so hard to get ahead? When you are: 'Doing well enough to stay in the occupation'; 'Doing as well as the average person in the occupation'; 'Doing much better than the average person in the occupation'; 'Recognized as one of the top persons in the occupation'." The 1983 survey used the word "profession" instead of "occupation" in the question.

19. This question posed, "If you were compared to most other students at this university, how would you be rated on the following points by an unbiased observer: Please indicate whether you would be rated among the" Highest; Above Average; Average; or Below Average, on each point." The statement students were asked to rate themselves on for this table item was, "The kind of person that you are, all things considered."

Table A-3 Correlation Matrix of Variable in Study; Means and Standard Deviations

N = 809 DF = 807 R@ .0500 = .0689 R@ .0100 = .0905

VARIABLE

| | | |

Table A-3

Correlation Matrix of Variables in Study; Means and Standard Deviations of Variables

Variable		N	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD DEV
MALE	Sex	1580	0	1.0000	.39747	.48953
WHTCOL	Campus Race	1583	0	1.0000	.43904	.49643
MEDUC	Mother's Education	1511	4.5000	20.000	12.205	3.7929
FAMINC	Family Income	1462	1.0000	17.000	5.8625	3.8286
HSGPA	Highschool Grade Point Average	1376	1.0000	4.0000	3.1212	.54691
UGPA	College Grade Point Average	1497	1.0000	4.0000	2.6746	.48994
LEAVE	Consider leaving the university	1560	0	1.0000	.36731	.48223
CAMPUSL	Feel Part of Campus Life	1571	1.0000	4.0000	2.5729	.93971
COMPETE	Academic Competition on Campus	1574	1.0000	4.0000	3.3170	.74575
RELUNIVX	Relations with Whites Index	1547	1.0000	12.000	5.4454	1.8717
STFACREL	Relations with White Faculty	1494	1.0000	4.0000	1.9418	.63178
STSTAFFR	Relations with White Staff	1378	1.0000	4.0000	2.0334	.65705
STSTUREL	Relations with White Students	1436	1.0000	4.0000	1.8948	.64073
RATTINDX	Racial Attitudes Index	1564	0	4.0000	2.5627	.97403
BKPRTY	National Black Political Party	1536	0	1.0000	.77148	.42001
MIXDATE	Interracial Dating	1542	0	1.0000	.58885	.49220
BCNTRL	Black Controlled Schools	1542	0	1.0000	.70039	.45824
UNITY	Black Student Unity	1544	0	1.0000	.54080	.49849
FUTOCC	Occupational Aspirations	1499	1.0000	96.020	70.594	16.125
SELFEST	Self Esteem	1550	1.0000	4.0000	3.0619	.69679
HOWFARSC	Educational Aspirations	1498	1.0000	4.0000	2.1195	1.0009
WHNSUCC	Career Striving	1507	1.0000	5.0000	4.2236	1.1395

National Study of Black College Students Research
Collaborators and Advisory Committee Members

RESEARCH COLLABORATORS
PREDOMINANTLY WHITE CAMPUSES

NAME/ADDRESS

Dr. Walter R. Allen
Department of Sociology and the
Center for Afroamerican/African Studies
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Dr. Henry T. Frierson
School of Medicine
Office of Medical Studies
324 MacNider Hall 202H
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dr. Bruce R. Hare
Department of Sociology
State University of New York
Stony Brook,New York 11790

Dr. Melvin Oliver
Department of Sociology
University of California-Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. Thomas Shick
Department of Afro-American Studies
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dr. Michael Thornton
Afro-American Studies Program
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197

RESEARCH COLLABORATORS
PREDOMINANTLY WHITE SCHOOLS
(CONTINUED)

Dr. Wade Smith
Department of Sociology
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Dr. Charles Williams
Department of Anthropology
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

RESEARCH COLLABORATORS
PREDOMINANTLY BLACK SCHOOLS

Dr. Barbara J. Barrett
Director--Counseling Center
Florida A & M University
Tallahasee, FL 32207

Dr. Geraldine K. Brookins
Department of Psychology
Jackson State University
Jackson, MS 39203

Dr. Robert Davis
Department of Sociology &
Social Service
North Carolina A & T
State University
Greensboro, NC 27411

Dr. Lawrence Delzine
Department of Sociology
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio 45384

Dr. Stella L. Hargett
Department of Sociology
Morgan State University
Baltimore, MD 21239

Dr. Jeffrey E. Smith
Director, Institute on Desegregation
North Carolina Central University
Durham, NC 27707

Dr. Alex Swan
Department of Sociology
Texas Southern University
Houston, TX 77004

Dr. Clarence Thornton
Southern University
Department of Sociology
Baton Rouge. LA 70813

NATIONAL STUDY OF BLACK COLLEGE STUDENTS

Advisory Board

Dr. Peter Dual, Dean
College of Human Services
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

Dr. Richard English, Dean
Howard University
School of Social Work
Washington, D.C. 20059

Dr. Edgar G. Epps
School of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637

Dr. James MacPartland, Director
Center for Social Organization of Schools
John Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dr. Gail Thomas, Research Scientist
Center for Social Organization of Schools
John Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD 21218

STUDY QUESTIONNAIRES

Copies of the study questionnaires for 1981 and 1983 may be obtained by contacting:

The Southern Education Foundation
811 Cypress Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30308

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Walter R. Allen is currently Associate Professor of Sociology and Afroamerican - African Studies and Project Director of the National Study of Black College Students at the University of Michigan--Ann Arbor. Allen received the A.B. degree in 1971 from Beloit College, the A.M. degree in 1973 and the Ph.D. degree in sociology from the University of Chicago in 1975. Later he completed postdoctoral study in psychosocial epidemiology from 1978 through 1979 at the University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill. In addition to teaching at the University of Michigan, Allen has held teaching appointments at the University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill, Duke University, Howard University and the University of Zimbabwe.

His honors include a Postdoctoral Research Fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation and a Senior Fulbright Lecturer Fellowship to the University of Zimbabwe. Allen has received research funding from the Southern Education, Ford, Rockefeller, C.S. Mott, Russell Sage and Spencer Foundations to conduct research in higher education, child socialization and population studies. Since 1983 he has served as Associate Editor for the Journal of Negro Education. Among his numerous publications is the co-edited volume Beginnings: The Social and Affective Development of Black Children, the coauthored book The Colorline and the Quality of Life: Problem of the Twenty-First Century and the coedited volume Research and Theory on Black Family Life: A Classified Title Index of the Published Literature, 1965-1982. His articles have appeared in the Journal of Comparative Family Studies, the Journal of Marriage and the Family, the Annual Review of Sociology, the Journal of Negro Education, Intergrateducation, Sociological Quarterly, Phylon and Signs: the Journal of Women in Culture and Society.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM RESEARCH SERIES

- A STUDY OF TITLE III IMPACT ON HISTORICALLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS,
  (Dr. Cameron Fincher, Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens)

- RECENT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENT PATTERNS OF BLACK STUDENTS IN STATES AFFECTED BY ADAMS-CALIFANO LITIGATION,
  (Dr. William Brazziel, University of Connecticut, and Marian Brazziel, Mansfield Center, Connecticut)

- ACCESS, RETENTION AND PROGRESSION OF BLACK STUDENTS THROUGH THE TWO-TIER FLORIDA HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM,
  (Dr. Charles Grigg, Florida State University, Institute of Social Research)

- BLACK EMPLOYEES IN TRADITIONALLY WHITE INSTITUTIONS IN THE ADAMS STATES: 1975 to 1977,
  (Dr. Anne S. Pruitt, Ohio State University)

- DETERMINING THE COLLEGE DESTINATION OF BLACK STUDENTS,
  (Dr. Gail E. Thomas and Dr. Jomills Henry Braddock II, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University)

- FACTORS RELATED TO THE POSTBACCALAUREATE CAREERS OF BLACK GRADUATES OF SELECTED FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS IN ALABAMA,
  (Dr. Rhoda B. Johnson, Tuskegee, Institute)

- COPING STRATEGIES: RETAINING BLACK STUDENTS IN COLLEGE
  (Dr. Yvonne Abatso, Langston Urban Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma)

- NETWORKING AND MENTORING: A STUDY OF CROSS-GENERATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF BLACKS IN GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS,
  (Dr. James E. Blackwell, University of Massachusetts/Boston)

- BLACK COLLEGE STUDENTS AND FACTORS INFLUENCING THEIR MAJOR FIELD CHOICE,
  (Dr. Gail E. Thomas, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University)

- INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN THE PRODUCTION OF BLACK BACCALAUREATES
  (Dr. Philip S. Hart, College of Public and Community Service, University of Massachusetts/Boston)

- EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND EARLY ATTAINMENT OF BLACK MALES AND FEMALES,
  (Dr. Edgar G. Epps, University of Chicago, and Dr. Kenneth W. Jackson, University of Houston Downtown Campus)

- FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO BLACK DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN TWO ADAMS STATES: A POLICY ANALYSIS,
  (Dr. James N. Upton and Anne S. Pruitt, Ohio State University)

- THE DECLINE OF TEACHER PRODUCTION IN LOUISIANA (1976-83) AND ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PROFESSION,
  (Dr. Antoine Garibaldi, Xavier University, Louisiana)